

Nonlinear Rayleigh-Taylor Instability for Nonhomogeneous Incompressible Viscous Magnetohydrodynamic Flows

Fei Jiang^{a,*}, Song Jiang^b, Weiwei Wang^a

^a*College of Mathematics and Computer Science, Fuzhou University, Fuzhou, 350108, China.*

^b*Institute of Applied Physics and Computational Mathematics, Beijing, 100088, China.*

Abstract

We investigate the nonlinear instability of a smooth Rayleigh-Taylor steady-state solution (including the case of height heavier density with increasing height) to the three-dimensional incompressible nonhomogeneous magnetohydrodynamic equations of zero resistivity in the presence of a uniform gravitational field. We first analyze the equations obtained from linearization around the steady-state solution. Then we construct solutions of the linearized problem that grow in time in the Sobolev space H^k , thus leading to a instability result for the linearized problem. With the help of the constructed unstable linear solutions and a local well-posedness result of classical solutions to the original nonlinear problem, we can show the instability of the nonlinear problem from the dynamics point of view. Moreover, we find that the third component of the velocity already induces the nonlinear instability.

Keywords: Navier-Stokes equations, steady solutions, Rayleigh-Taylor instability, incompressible magnetohydrodynamic fluids.

2000 MSC: 35Q35, 76D03.

1. Introduction

This paper is concerned with the nonlinear Rayleigh-Taylor (RT) instability of a smooth RT steady-state solution to the following three-dimensional nonhomogeneous incompressible magnetohydrodynamic (MHD) equations with zero resistivity (i.e. without magnetic diffusivity) under the presence of a uniform gravitational field in a domain Ω (see, for example, [2, 21, 23, 25] on the derivation of the equations):

$$\begin{cases} \rho_t + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla \rho = 0, \\ \rho \mathbf{v}_t + \rho \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v} + \nabla p = (\nabla \times \mathbf{M}) \times \mathbf{M} + \mu \Delta \mathbf{v} - \rho g \mathbf{e}_3, \\ \mathbf{M}_t - \nabla \times (\mathbf{v} \times \mathbf{M}) = \mathbf{0}, \\ \operatorname{div} \mathbf{v} = 0, \quad \operatorname{div} \mathbf{M} = 0. \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

Here the unknowns $\rho := \rho(t, \mathbf{x})$, $\mathbf{v} := \mathbf{v}(t, \mathbf{x})$, $\mathbf{M} := \mathbf{M}(t, \mathbf{x})$ and $p := p(t, \mathbf{x})$ denote the density, velocity, magnetic field and pressure of the incompressible fluid, respectively. $\mu > 0$ stands for the coefficient of shear viscosity, $g > 0$ for the gravitational constant, $\mathbf{e}_3 = (0, 0, 1)$ for the vertical unit vector, and $-g\mathbf{e}_3$ for the gravitational force. In the system (1.1) the equation (1.1)₁

*Corresponding author: Tel +86-18305950592.

Email addresses: jiangfei0591@163.com (Fei Jiang), jiang@iapcm.ac.cn (Song Jiang), wei.wei.84@163.com (Weiwei Wang)

is the continuity equation, while $(1.1)_2$ describes the balance law of momentum. It is well-known that the electromagnetic field is governed by the Maxwell equations. In MHD, the displacement current can be neglected [21, 23]. As a consequence, $(1.1)_3$ is called the induction equation. As for the constraint $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{M} = 0$, it can be seen just as a restriction on the initial value of $\mathbf{M}$ since $(\operatorname{div} \mathbf{M})_t = 0$. We remark that, the resistivity in $(1.1)_3$ is zero, which arises in the physics regime with negligible electrical resistance, see [3]. In addition, if $\mathbf{M} \equiv 0$, equations (1.1) reduces to a standard Navier-Stokes equations of incompressible viscous fluids in the presence of a uniform gravitational field.

In this paper we consider the problem of the RT instability in a horizontal periodic domain, thus we define $\Omega := (2\pi L\mathbb{T})^2 \times \mathbb{R}$ and assume that a smooth RT (steady-state) density profile $\bar{\rho} := \bar{\rho}(x_3) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ exists which satisfies

$$\bar{\rho}' \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}), \quad \inf_{x_3 \in \mathbb{R}} \bar{\rho} > 0, \quad (1.2)$$

$$\bar{\rho}'(x_3^0) > 0 \quad \text{for some point } x_3^0 \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (1.3)$$

Here $' = d/dx_3$, and we have written $2\pi L\mathbb{T}$ for the 1D-torus of length $2\pi L$. We refer to [16, Remark 1.1] on the construction of such $\bar{\rho}$. Let $\bar{\mathbf{M}} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ be a constant magnetic field, then the RT density profile $\bar{\rho}$ with $(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{M})(t, \mathbf{x}) \equiv (\mathbf{0}, \bar{\mathbf{M}})$ defines a steady state to (1.1), provided (in fact the steady pressure $\bar{p}$ is determined by $\bar{\rho}$)

$$\nabla \bar{p} = -\bar{\rho} g \mathbf{e}_3, \quad \text{i.e.,} \quad \frac{d\bar{p}}{dx_3} = -\bar{\rho} g.$$

We point out that by virtue of the condition (1.3), there is at least a region in which the RT density profile has larger density with increasing x_3 (height), thus this will lead to the classical RT instability as shown in Theorem 1.1 below.

Now, we denote the perturbation by

$$\varrho = \rho - \bar{\rho}, \quad \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{0}, \quad \mathbf{N} = \mathbf{M} - \bar{\mathbf{M}}, \quad q = p - \bar{p},$$

then, $(\varrho, \mathbf{u}, q)$ satisfies the perturbed equations

$$\begin{cases} \varrho_t + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla (\varrho + \bar{\rho}) = 0, \\ (\varrho + \bar{\rho}) \mathbf{u}_t + (\varrho + \bar{\rho}) \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} + \nabla q + g \varrho \mathbf{e}_3 = \mu \Delta \mathbf{u} + (\nabla \times \mathbf{N}) \times (\mathbf{N} + \bar{\mathbf{M}}), \\ \mathbf{N}_t = \nabla \times (\mathbf{u} \times (\mathbf{N} + \bar{\mathbf{M}})), \\ \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} = 0, \quad \operatorname{div} \mathbf{N} = 0. \end{cases} \quad (1.4)$$

To complete the statement of the perturbed problem, we specify the initial and boundary conditions:

$$(\varrho, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{N})|_{t=0} = (\varrho_0, \mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{N}_0) \quad \text{in } \Omega \quad (1.5)$$

and

$$\lim_{|x_3| \rightarrow +\infty} (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{N})(t, \mathbf{x}', x_3) = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{for any } t > 0, \quad (1.6)$$

where we have written $\mathbf{x}' = x_1 \mathbf{e}_1 + x_2 \mathbf{e}_2$, $\mathbf{e}_1 := (1, 0, 0)$ and $\mathbf{e}_2 := (0, 1, 0)$. Moreover, the initial data should satisfy the compatibility conditions $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}_0 = 0$ and $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{N}_0 = 0$.

If we linearize the equations (1.4) around the steady state $(\bar{\rho}, \mathbf{0})$, then the resulting linearized equations reads as

$$\begin{cases} \varrho_t + \bar{\rho}' u_3 = 0, \\ \bar{\rho} \mathbf{u}_t + \nabla q + g \varrho \mathbf{e}_3 = \mu \Delta \mathbf{u} + (\nabla \times \mathbf{N}) \times \bar{\mathbf{M}}, \\ \mathbf{N}_t = \nabla \times (\mathbf{u} \times \bar{\mathbf{M}}), \\ \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} = 0, \quad \operatorname{div} \mathbf{N} = 0. \end{cases} \quad (1.7)$$

The RT instability is well known as gravity-driven instability in fluids when heavy fluid is on top of light one. The linear instability for an incompressible fluid was first introduced by Rayleigh in 1883 [28]. The analogue of the RT instability arises when the fluids are electrically conducting and a magnetic field is present, and the growth of the instability will be influenced by the magnetic field due to the generated electromagnetic induction and the Lorentz force. Some authors have extended the partial results concerning the RT instability to the case of MHD fluids by overcoming difficulties induced by presence of the magnetic field. For instance, Kruskal and Schwarzschild in 1954 first showed that a horizontal magnetic field has no effect on the development of the linear RT instability [20]. Then the influence of a vertical magnetic field was investigated by Hide in [13] where the effect of finite viscosity and resistivity was included and his analysis was encumbered with many parameters. By a variational approach, Hwang in 2008 studied the nonlinear RT instability of (1.4)–(1.5) for the inviscid case (i.e. $\mu = 0$) in a two-dimensional periodic domain [14].

To our best knowledge, however, it is still open mathematically whether there exists a unstable solution to the nonlinear RT problem (1.4)–(1.6) of 3D viscous MHD fluids. The aim of this article is to prove rigorously the instability for the nonlinear RT problem (1.4)–(1.6). The main result reads as follows.

Theorem 1.1. *Let the critical number*

$$M_c := \sqrt{\sup_{\substack{\psi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}) \\ \psi \neq 0}} \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}} g \bar{\rho}' |\psi|^2 dx}{\int_{\mathbb{R}} |\psi'|^2 dx}} > 0. \quad (1.8)$$

Assume that the RT density profile $\bar{\rho}$ satisfies (1.2) and (1.3), and

$$\bar{\mathbf{M}} = \begin{cases} M \mathbf{e}_1, & M \neq 0, \text{ constant,} \\ M \mathbf{e}_3, & |M| \in (0, M_c), \text{ constant.} \end{cases} \quad (1.9)$$

Then, the steady state $(\bar{\rho}, \mathbf{0}, \bar{\mathbf{M}})$ of (1.4)–(1.6) is unstable, that is, there exist positive constants Λ^* , ε_0 and ι , and a triple $(\bar{\varrho}_0, \bar{\mathbf{u}}_0, \bar{\mathbf{N}}_0) \in H^\infty(\Omega) := \cap_{k=0}^\infty H^k(\Omega)$, such that for any $\delta \in (0, \iota)$ and the initial data $(\varrho_0, \mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{N}_0) := (\delta \bar{\varrho}_0, \delta \bar{\mathbf{u}}_0, \delta \bar{\mathbf{N}}_0)$ there is a unique classical solution $(\varrho, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{N})$ of (1.4)–(1.6) on $[0, T^{\max})$, but the third component of the velocity satisfies

$$\|u_3(T^\delta)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \geq \varepsilon_0 \text{ for some escape time } T^\delta := \frac{1}{\Lambda^*} \ln \frac{2\varepsilon_0}{\delta} \in (0, T^{\max}), \quad (1.10)$$

where $T^{\max}$ denotes the maximal time of existence of the solution $(\varrho, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{N})$.

Remark 1.1. We should point out that since the above Sobolev spaces $H^k(\Omega)$ are defined on the horizontal periodic domain $\Omega = (2\pi L\mathbb{T})^2 \times \mathbb{R}$, the solution $(\varrho, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{N})$ constructed in Theorem 1.1 is horizontally periodic. One should keep this in mind in what follows.

Throughout the rest of this article we shall repeatedly use the abbreviations:

$$W^{m,p} := W^{m,p}(\Omega), \quad H^m := H^m(\Omega), \quad H^\infty := \cap_{m=1}^\infty H^m(\Omega), \quad L^p := L^p(\Omega), \\ \|\cdot\|_{W^{m,p}} := \|\cdot\|_{W^{m,p}(\Omega)}, \quad \|\cdot\|_{H^m} := \|\cdot\|_{H^m(\Omega)}, \quad \|\cdot\|_{L^p} := \|\cdot\|_{L^p(\Omega)}, \quad \text{etc.}$$

Remark 1.2. Theorem 1.1 gives the instability of the third component of the velocity. We mention that the instability of the third component of magnetic field (i.e., N_3) can be obtained for the case of $\bar{\mathbf{M}} = M \mathbf{e}_3$ thanks to Remark 2.4. More precisely, one can use the linear instability of N_3 in Remark 2.4 to show the nonlinear instability of N_3 in the original problem in the same way as one utilizes (2.60) to get the nonlinear instability (1.10).

Remark 1.3. Theorem 1.1 also holds for the general horizontal magnetic field $\bar{\mathbf{M}} = (M_1, M_2, 0)$. In fact, rotating the $o-xy$ coordinates properly so that $\bar{\mathbf{M}} = (M, 0, 0)$ with $M = \sqrt{M_1^2 + M_2^2}$, we have the same case as in Theorem 1.1 under the rotated coordinates, since the L^2 -norm of the third component of velocity is invariant under the horizontal rotation. In addition, Theorem 1.1 also holds when $\bar{\mathbf{M}} = \mathbf{N} = \mathbf{0}$ (the case of incompressible viscous fluids), hence the weak RT instability for incompressible viscous fluids given in [16] can be further shown to be the strong RT instability as (1.10) in the case of the horizontal periodic domain.

Remark 1.4. The number M_c in (1.8) may be infinite. In fact, we can construct a RT density profile $\bar{\rho}$ satisfying (1.2), (1.3) and $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \bar{\rho}' dx > 0$. Let $\text{supp} \bar{\rho}' \subset (-l, l)$ with $l > 0$, and

$$\psi_n(x) := \begin{cases} 1, & x \in [-l, l], \\ 1 + (x + l)/n, & x \in (-l - n, -l), \\ 1 - (x - l)/n, & x \in (l, l + n), \\ 0 & x \notin (-l - n, l + n). \end{cases}$$

Then $\psi_n(x) \in H^1(\mathbb{R})$ and

$$\frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}} g \bar{\rho}' |\psi_n|^2 dy}{\int_{\mathbb{R}} |\psi_n'|^2 dy} \geq gn \int_{\mathbb{R}} \bar{\rho}' dx \rightarrow \infty \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

which implies $M_c = \infty$. Thus we see that the vertical magnetic field in this case has no influence on the development of the nonlinear RT instability, provided $\bar{\rho}(+\infty) := \lim_{x_3 \rightarrow +\infty} \bar{\rho}(x_3) > \bar{\rho}(-\infty) := \lim_{x_3 \rightarrow -\infty} \bar{\rho}(x_3)$. Moreover, in such a case, we can infer that the critical frequency constant $|\xi|_{\text{vc}}^M$ defined by (2.15) is equal to zero.

Remark 1.5. In [7] Hwang and Guo proved the nonlinear RT instability for two-dimensional nonhomogeneous incompressible inviscid flows (i.e. $\mu = 0$ and $\bar{\mathbf{M}} = \mathbf{N} = \mathbf{0}$ in (1.4), (1.5)) with boundary condition $\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n}|_{\partial\Omega'} = 0$ where $\Omega' = \{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid -l < x_2 < m\}$ and $\mathbf{n}$ denotes the outer normal vector to $\partial\Omega'$. Our instability result Theorem 1.1 differs from that of Hwang and Guo in that only $\|u_3\|_{L^2}$ is needed here to describe the instability. This is also different from that of Hwang [7], in which the instability for an inhomogeneous incompressible inviscid MHD fluid is described by the norm $\|(\varrho, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{N})\|_{L^2(\Omega')}$.

The proof of Theorem 1.1 is divided into four steps given in Sections 2–5: (i) First, we make an ansatz to seek the “normal mode” solutions of the linearized equations (1.7), which are supposed to be grow exponentially in time by the factor $e^{\lambda(\xi)t}$ with $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^2$ being the horizontal spatial frequency and $\lambda(\xi) > 0$. This reduces the equations to a system of ordinary differential equations (ODEs) defined on $\mathbb{R}$ with $\lambda(\xi) > 0$ for some ξ (see (2.4), (2.5)). Those points ξ constitute a solvable domain. Because of presence of the magnetic field, the solvable domain is not a ball for the horizontal case as in [10], resulting in additional technical difficulties. In order to circumvent such difficulties, we shall introduce new notion of the critical frequency function $S(\xi)$ and critical frequency constant $|\xi|_{\text{vc}}^M$ (see (2.14), (2.15)) to define the solvable domain $\mathbb{A}^g$. Thus, by careful constructing the solutions and adapting the modified variational method in [10], we can also solve the ODEs for any given $\xi \in \mathbb{A}^g$ and obtain a normal mode with $\lambda(\xi) > 0$, providing thus a mechanism for the global linear RT instability. Using the normal modes, we can further construct real-valued solutions of the linearized Cauchy problem (1.5)–(1.7) that grow in time, when measured in $H^k(\Omega)$ for any $k \geq 0$. In particular, the third component of velocity in the linear solutions are non-zero functions, which plays a key role in the nonlinear instability

in (1.10). (ii) In Section 3, we further show that Λ is indeed a sharp exponential growth rate for general solutions to the linearized problem. The main idea in the proof was first used by Hwang and Guo for the inviscid incompressible fluids, and then adapted by Guo and Tice [10] for viscous fluids. Thus, based on Duhamel's principle, we can bound the nonlinear terms by the sharp exponential growth rates (see (5.7)). (iii) In Section 4, we derive the integrand form of Gronwall's inequality of high-order energy estimate $\mathcal{E}(\varrho, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{N})$ for the perturbed problem (1.4)–(1.6), which makes the escape time occurring before the blow-up time of the classical solutions. Since the equilibrium state of the magnetic field $\bar{\mathbf{M}}$ is a no-zero vector, we shall introduce a new technique to deal with the terms including $\bar{\mathbf{M}}$ in the energy estimates, see Subsection 4.4. (iv) Finally, in Section 5, with the help of the results established in Sections 2–4, we modify the approach in [8] to establish the instability of the nonlinear problem in the sense of (1.10). We mention that the approach in [8] has been also used to treat the instability of other problems, see [6, 15, 31] for examples.

We end this section by briefly reviewing some of the previous results on the nonlinear RT instability for two layer incompressible fluids separated by a free interface (stratified fluids), where the RT steady-state solution is a denser fluid lying above a lighter one separated by a free interface. When the densities of two layer fluids are two constants, Wang and Tice [31] proved the (local) existence of nonlinear unstable solutions in a horizontal periodic domain $\mathbb{T}^2 \times (-b, 1)$, where the instability term is described by the sum of L^2 -norm of the velocity and the moving internal interface. Prüss and Simonett used the C^0 -semigroup theory and the Henry instability theorem to show the existence of nonlinear unstable solutions in the Sobolev-Slobodeckii spaces in $\mathbb{R}^3$ [27], where the instability term is described by the sum of $\|\mathbf{u}\|_{W_p^{2-2/p}(\mathbb{R}^3)}$ and $\|\mathbf{h}\|_{W_p^{3-2/p}(\mathbb{R}^3)}$ (see [27, Theorem 1.2] for details). When densities of two layer fluids are variable, to our best knowledge, the (local) existence of solutions to the nonlinear problem (1.4)–(1.6) still remains open, consequently, the strong nonlinear instability is still open. For compressible fluids there are very few results on the nonlinear RT instability. Guo and Tice proved the instability of immiscible compressible inviscid fluids in the frame of Lagrangian coordinates under the assumption of the existence of solutions [12]. This is in some sense a compressible analogue to the local ill-posedness of the RT problem for incompressible fluids given in [5].

Finally we mention some results on the instability for stratified MHD fluids. Wang [30] introduced the critical number of stratified MHD fluids (denoted by M_c^s) to investigate the linear RT instability of stratified MHD fluids in a infinite slab domain $\mathbb{R}^2 \times (-l, l)$. Later, Jiang et al. [17] further showed the weak nonlinear RT instability of stratified MHD fluids and found that $M_c^s = \sqrt{gl(\varrho_+ - \varrho_-)/2}$, where $\varrho_+ > \varrho_-$, and ϱ_+ resp. ϱ_- denotes the density of the upper-resp. lower-layer fluid. Obviously, $M_c^s \rightarrow \infty$ as the height $2l \rightarrow \infty$. Hence the critical number of stratified MHD fluids in $\mathbb{R}^3$ is infinite. This means that the vertical magnetic field may have no influence on the development of the RT instability in $\mathbb{R}^3$. Due to some technical difficulties, however, we do not know whether Theorem 1.1 still holds for the corresponding stratified MHD fluids.

2. Construction of solutions to the linearized problem

We wish to construct a solution to the linearized equations (1.7) that has growing H^k -norm for any k . We will construct such solutions via some synthesis as in [10] by first constructing a growing mode for any but fixed spatial frequency. Moreover, we shall introduce the techniques of the critical frequency function and critical frequency constant to carefully analyze the terms involving with the magnetic field.

2.1. Linear growing modes

To start with, we make a growing mode ansatz of solutions, i.e.,

$$\varrho(t, \mathbf{x}) = \tilde{\rho}(\mathbf{x})e^{\lambda t}, \quad \mathbf{u}(t, \mathbf{x}) = \tilde{\mathbf{v}}(\mathbf{x})e^{\lambda t}, \quad q(t, \mathbf{x}) = \tilde{p}(\mathbf{x})e^{\lambda t}, \quad \mathbf{N}(t, \mathbf{x}) = \tilde{\mathbf{M}}(\mathbf{x})e^{\lambda t} \quad \text{for some } \lambda > 0.$$

Substituting this ansatz into (1.7), and then eliminating $\tilde{\rho}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{M}}$ by using the first and third equations, we arrive at the time-independent system for $\tilde{\mathbf{v}} = (\tilde{v}_1, \tilde{v}_2, \tilde{v}_3)$ and $\tilde{p}$:

$$\begin{cases} \lambda^2 \tilde{\rho} \tilde{\mathbf{v}} + \lambda \nabla \tilde{p} = (\nabla \times (\nabla \times (\tilde{\mathbf{v}} \times \bar{\mathbf{M}}))) \times \bar{\mathbf{M}} + \lambda \mu \Delta \tilde{\mathbf{v}} + g \tilde{\rho}' \tilde{v}_3 \mathbf{e}_3, \\ \operatorname{div} \tilde{\mathbf{v}} = 0 \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

with

$$\lim_{|x_3| \rightarrow +\infty} (\tilde{\mathbf{v}}, \tilde{\mathbf{M}})(\mathbf{x}', x_3) = \mathbf{0}, \quad (2.2)$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{M}}$ is given by (1.9). After a straightforward calculation, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla \times (\nabla \times (\tilde{\mathbf{v}} \times \bar{\mathbf{M}})) \times \bar{\mathbf{M}} &= \nabla \times (\bar{\mathbf{M}} \cdot \nabla \tilde{\mathbf{v}}) \times \bar{\mathbf{M}} \\ &= M^2 \begin{cases} (0, \partial_1^2 u_2 - \partial_{21}^2 u_1, \partial_{11}^2 u_3 - \partial_{31}^2 u_1), & \text{for } \bar{\mathbf{M}} = M \mathbf{e}_1; \\ (\partial_3^2 u_1 - \partial_{13}^2 u_3, \partial_{33}^2 u_2 - \partial_{23}^2 u_3, 0), & \text{for } \bar{\mathbf{M}} = M \mathbf{e}_3. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

We fix a spatial frequency $\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, and define the new unknowns

$$\tilde{v}_1(\mathbf{x}) = -i\varphi(x_3)e^{i\mathbf{x}' \cdot \xi}, \quad \tilde{v}_2(\mathbf{x}) = -i\theta(x_3)e^{i\mathbf{x}' \cdot \xi}, \quad \tilde{v}_3(\mathbf{x}) = \psi(x_3)e^{i\mathbf{x}' \cdot \xi}, \quad \tilde{p}(\mathbf{x}) = \pi(x_3)e^{i\mathbf{x}' \cdot \xi}.$$

Then, in view of (2.1)–(2.3), we see that φ , θ , ψ and λ satisfy the following system of ODEs:

$$\begin{cases} \lambda^2 \bar{\rho} \varphi - \lambda \xi_1 \pi + \lambda \mu (|\xi|^2 \varphi - \varphi'') = M^2 B_1, \\ \lambda^2 \bar{\rho} \theta - \lambda \xi_2 \pi + \lambda \mu (|\xi|^2 \theta - \theta'') = M^2 B_2, \\ \lambda^2 \bar{\rho} \psi + \lambda \pi' + \lambda \mu (|\xi|^2 \psi - \psi'') - g \bar{\rho}' \psi = M^2 B_3, \\ \xi_1 \varphi + \xi_2 \theta + \psi' = 0 \end{cases} \quad (2.4)$$

with

$$\varphi(-\infty) = \theta(-\infty) = \psi(-\infty) = \varphi(+\infty) = \theta(+\infty) = \psi(+\infty) = 0, \quad (2.5)$$

where

$$\begin{pmatrix} B_1 \\ B_2 \\ B_3 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{cases} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ (\xi_1 \xi_2 \varphi - \xi_1^2 \theta) \\ -(|\xi|^2 \psi + \xi_1 \varphi') \end{pmatrix} & \text{for } \bar{\mathbf{M}} = M \mathbf{e}_1, \\ \begin{pmatrix} (\varphi'' + \xi_1 \psi') \\ (\theta'' + \xi_2 \psi') \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} & \text{for } \bar{\mathbf{M}} = M \mathbf{e}_3. \end{cases}$$

Eliminating π from the third equation in (2.4), we obtain the following ODE for ψ

$$\begin{aligned} & -\lambda^2 [\bar{\rho} |\xi|^2 \psi - (\bar{\rho} \psi')'] \\ & = \lambda \mu (|\xi|^4 \psi - 2|\xi|^2 \psi'' + \psi'''') - g |\xi|^2 \bar{\rho}' \psi + M^2 \begin{cases} \xi_1^2 (|\xi|^2 \psi - \psi''), & \text{for } \bar{\mathbf{M}} = M \mathbf{e}_1, \\ (\psi'''' - |\xi|^2 \psi''), & \text{for } \bar{\mathbf{M}} = M \mathbf{e}_3, \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

with

$$\psi(-\infty) = \psi'(-\infty) = \psi(+\infty) = \psi'(+\infty) = 0. \quad (2.7)$$

Next we use the modified variational method to construct a solution of (2.6), (2.7). This idea can be found in Guo and Tice's paper on compressible viscous stratified flows [10], and is adapted by other authors to study the instability for other fluid models [4, 15, 18, 30]. To this end, we now fix a non-zero vector $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $s > 0$. From (2.6) and (2.7) we get a family of the modified problems

$$\begin{aligned} & -\lambda^2[\bar{\rho}|\xi|^2\psi - (\bar{\rho}\psi')'] \\ & = s\mu(|\xi|^4\psi - 2|\xi|^2\psi'' + \psi'''' - g|\xi|^2\bar{\rho}'\psi + M^2 \begin{cases} \xi_1^2(|\xi|^2\psi - \psi''), & \text{for } \bar{\mathbf{M}} = M\mathbf{e}_1, \\ (\psi'''' - |\xi|^2\psi''), & \text{for } \bar{\mathbf{M}} = M\mathbf{e}_3, \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

coupled with the condition (2.7). We define the energy functional of (2.8) by

$$E(\psi) = |\xi|^2 E_0(\psi) + sE_1(\psi) \quad (2.9)$$

with an associated admissible set

$$\mathcal{A} = \left\{ \psi \in H^2(\mathbb{R}) \mid J(\psi) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} \bar{\rho}(|\xi|^2|\psi|^2 + |\psi'|^2)dx_3 = 1 \right\}, \quad (2.10)$$

where

$$E_0(\psi) = M^2 \begin{cases} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \xi_1^2 \left(|\psi|^2 + \frac{|\psi'|^2}{|\xi|^2} \right) - g\bar{\rho}'\psi^2 dx_3, & \text{for } \bar{\mathbf{M}} = M\mathbf{e}_1, \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(|\psi'|^2 + \frac{|\psi''|^2}{|\xi|^2} \right) - g\bar{\rho}'\psi^2 dx_3, & \text{for } \bar{\mathbf{M}} = M\mathbf{e}_3, \end{cases} \quad (2.11)$$

$$E_1(\psi) = \mu \int_{\mathbb{R}} (4|\xi|^2|\psi'|^2 + ||\xi|^2\psi + \psi''|^2)dx_3. \quad (2.12)$$

Thus we can find a $-\lambda^2$ (depending on ξ) by minimizing

$$-\lambda^2(\xi) = \alpha(\xi) := \inf_{\psi \in \mathcal{A}} E(\psi). \quad (2.13)$$

In order to emphasize the dependence on $s \in (0, \infty)$ we will sometimes write

$$E(\psi, s) := E(\psi) \text{ and } \alpha(s) := \inf_{\psi \in \mathcal{A}} E(\psi, s) < +\infty.$$

Before constructing the growth solutions, we shall introduce some preliminary results, which will be used in Subsections 2.2–2.4. Let the critical frequency function $S(\xi)$ for the horizontal case and the critical frequency constant $|\xi|_{\text{vc}}^M$ for the vertical case be given by the following variational forms

$$S(\xi) := \sqrt{\sup_{\psi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}), \psi \not\equiv 0} \frac{g|\xi|^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}} \bar{\rho}'\psi^2 dx_3 / (M\xi_1)^2 - \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\psi'|^2 dx_3}{\int_{\mathbb{R}} |\psi|^2 dx_3}} \quad (2.14)$$

for $0 < |M\xi_1|/|\xi| < M_c$, and

$$|\xi|_{\text{vc}}^M := \sqrt{\inf_{\psi \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{vc}}} \frac{M^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\psi''|^2 dx_3}{\int_{\mathbb{R}} (g\bar{\rho}'\psi^2 - M^2|\psi'|^2) dy}} \quad \text{for } |M| \in (0, M_c), \quad (2.15)$$

respectively, where M_c is given by (1.8), and

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{vc}} := \left\{ \psi \in H^2(\mathbb{R}) \mid \int_{\mathbb{R}} (g\bar{\rho}'\psi^2 - M^2|\psi'|^2) dx_3 > 0 \right\}.$$

Now we define a solvable domain for a growing solution

$$\mathbb{A}^g = \begin{cases} \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid |\xi_1 M|/|\xi| \in (0, M_c), |\xi| < S(\xi)\} \cup \{\xi_1 = 0\} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\} & \text{for } \bar{\mathbf{M}} = M\mathbf{e}_1, \\ \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid |\xi|_{\text{vc}}^M < |\xi|\} & \text{for } \bar{\mathbf{M}} = M\mathbf{e}_3 \text{ with } |M| \in (0, M_c). \end{cases} \quad (2.16)$$

By virtue of the definition of M_c , it is easy to verify that the above two definitions (2.14), (2.15) make sense. Moreover, $|\xi|_{\text{vc}}^M$ and $S(\xi)$ are finite. Next we introduce some properties concerning with the critical frequency and the solvable domain $\mathbb{A}^g$.

Proposition 2.1. *The supremum in (2.14) is achieved for each ξ and M with $\xi_1 M \neq 0$. Moreover, $S(\xi)$ is continuous on $\mathbb{D} := \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid 0 < |M\xi_1|/|\xi| < M_c\}$ for any given $M \neq 0$, and*

$$S(\xi) \rightarrow +\infty \quad \text{as} \quad \frac{\xi_1}{|\xi|} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \xi \in \mathbb{D}. \quad (2.17)$$

PROOF. We rewrite (2.14) as

$$S^2(\xi) = \sup_{\mathcal{A}_{L^2}} Q(\psi),$$

where

$$Q(\psi) := \frac{g|\xi|^2}{(M\xi_1)^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \bar{\rho}'\psi^2 dx_3 - \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\psi'|^2 dx_3, \quad \mathcal{A}_{L^2} := \left\{ H^1(\mathbb{R}) \mid \|\psi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 = 1 \right\}. \quad (2.18)$$

Then, it is easy to see that $S^2(\xi) > 0$, since $0 < |M\xi_1|/|\xi| < M_c$. Let $\psi_n \in \mathcal{A}_{L^2}$ be a minimizing sequence of $S^2(\xi)$, i.e., $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} Q(\psi_n) = \sup_{\mathcal{A}_{L^2}} Q(\psi)$, we have from (2.18) that ψ_n is uniformly bounded in $H^1(\mathbb{R})$ on n . Hence there exists a $\psi_0 \in H^1(\mathbb{R})$, such that $\psi_n \rightarrow \psi_0$ weakly in $H^1(\mathbb{R})$ and strongly in $L_{\text{loc}}^2(\mathbb{R})$. Hence,

$$0 < \sup_{\mathcal{A}_{L^2}} Q(\psi) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} Q(\psi_n) \leq Q(\psi_0) \quad \text{and} \quad 0 < \|\psi_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\psi_n\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} = 1.$$

We proceed to verify that $\|\psi_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} = 1$. Suppose by contradiction that $\|\psi_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} < 1$, then we may scale up ψ_0 by $\alpha > 1$ so that $\alpha\psi_0 \in \mathcal{A}_{L^2}$. From this we deduce that

$$\sup_{\mathcal{A}_{L^2}} Q(\psi) \geq Q(\alpha\psi_0) = \alpha^2 Q(\psi_0) \geq \alpha^2 \sup_{\mathcal{A}_{L^2}} Q(\psi) > \sup_{\mathcal{A}_{L^2}} Q(\psi),$$

which is a contradiction. Hence $\|\psi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} = 1$, which shows that $Q(\psi)$ achieves its infimum on $\mathcal{A}_{L^2}$.

Next, we prove the continuity of $S^2(\xi_0)$ for each given ξ_0 in $\mathbb{D}$. Letting $\xi \in \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \xi_0$, we have $|\xi|^2/\xi_1^2 \rightarrow |\xi_0|^2/\xi_{01}^2$, where ξ_{01} represents the first component of ξ_0 . Without loss of generality, we assume that $|\xi|^2/\xi_1^2$ and $|\xi_0|^2/\xi_{01}^2$ belong to a finite interval (a, b) with $a > 0$. Denote $\delta := |\xi|^2/\xi_1^2 - |\xi_0|^2/\xi_{01}^2$, then $\delta \rightarrow 0$ as $\xi \rightarrow \xi_0$.

On the other hand, $Q(\psi)$ achieves its infimum on $\mathcal{A}_{L^2}$, i.e. for any $\xi \in \mathbb{D}$, there is $\psi_\xi \in \mathcal{A}_{L^2}$, such that

$$S^2(\xi) := \frac{g|\xi|^2}{(M\xi_1)^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \bar{\rho}'\psi_\xi^2 dx_3 - \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\psi_\xi'|^2 dx_3. \quad (2.19)$$

Substituting $|\xi_0|^2/\xi_{01}^2 = |\xi|^2/\xi_1^2 - \delta$ into (2.19), one has

$$\begin{aligned} S^2(\xi) &= \frac{g|\xi_0|^2}{(M\xi_{01})^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \bar{\rho}' \psi_{\xi}^2 dx_3 - \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\psi'_{\xi}|^2 dx_3 + \frac{g\delta}{M^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \bar{\rho}' \psi_{\xi}^2 dx_3 \\ &\leq S(\xi_0) + \frac{g\delta}{M^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \bar{\rho}' \psi_{\xi}^2 dx_3. \end{aligned} \quad (2.20)$$

Similar to (2.20), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} S^2(\xi_0) &= \frac{g|\xi|^2}{(M\xi_1)^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \bar{\rho}' \psi_{\xi_0}^2 dx_3 - \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\psi'_{\xi_0}|^2 dx_3 - \frac{g\delta}{M^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \bar{\rho}' \psi_{\xi_0}^2 dx_3 \\ &\leq S(\xi) - \frac{g\delta}{M^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \bar{\rho}' \psi_{\xi_0}^2 dx_3, \end{aligned}$$

which, together with (2.20), yields that

$$\frac{g\delta}{M^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \bar{\rho}' \psi_{\xi_0}^2 dx_3 \leq S^2(\xi) - S^2(\xi_0) \leq \frac{g\delta}{M^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \bar{\rho}' \psi_{\xi}^2 dx_3.$$

Hence,

$$|S^2(\xi) - S^2(\xi_0)| \leq \frac{g\delta}{M^2} \|\bar{\rho}'\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } \delta \rightarrow 0,$$

and $S^2(\xi)$ is continuous at each given point $\xi_0 \in \mathbb{D}$. Finally, (2.17) obviously holds by the definition (2.14). The completes the proof. $\square$

Proposition 2.2. *Let $\mathbb{A}^g$ be defined by (2.16), then*

- (1) *the set $\mathbb{A}^g$ is symmetric on x -axis and y -axis in $\mathbb{R}^2$, respectively;*
- (2) *the set $\mathbb{A}^g$ is a nonempty open set in $\mathbb{R}^2$;*
- (3) *$\mathbb{A}^g \cap (L^{-1}\mathbb{Z})^2 \neq \emptyset$.*

PROOF. It is easy to see that the above assertions obviously hold. We remark that we have used (2.17) and the continuity of $S(\xi)$ in the verification of the second assertion for the horizontal case. $\square$

Proposition 2.3. *Let $\xi \neq 0$. If $\xi \in \mathbb{A}^g$, then there exists a*

$$\psi_0 \in \begin{cases} H^1(\mathbb{R}) & \text{for the horizontal case,} \\ \mathcal{M}_{\text{vc}} & \text{for the vertical case,} \end{cases}$$

such that either $E_0(\psi_0) < 0$, or $|\xi|^2 E_0(\psi) \geq 0$ for any

$$\psi \in \begin{cases} H^1(\mathbb{R}) & \text{for the horizontal case;} \\ H^2(\mathbb{R}) & \text{for the vertical case.} \end{cases}$$

PROOF. The above assertions in fact follow from the definitions (1.8), (2.11) and (2.14)–(2.16), here we only give the proof of the horizontal case for the reader's convenience.

Let $\xi \in \mathbb{A}^g$. If $\xi_1 = 0$, then obviously, there exists a ψ_0 , such that

$$E_0 = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left[(M\xi_1)^2 \left(|\psi_0|^2 + \frac{|\psi'_0|^2}{|\xi|^2} \right) - g\bar{\rho}' \psi_0^2 \right] dx_3 = \int_{\mathbb{R}} -g\bar{\rho}' \psi_0^2 dx_3 < 0.$$

If ξ satisfies $|M\xi_1|/|\xi| \in (0, M_c)$ and $|\xi| < S(\xi)$, then by virtue of the definition of (2.14), there also exists a ψ_0 , such that

$$E_0 = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left[(M\xi_1)^2 \left(|\psi_0|^2 + \frac{|\psi'_0|^2}{|\xi|^2} \right) - g\bar{\rho}'\psi_0^2 \right] dx_3 < 0.$$

Summing up the above discussions, we see that there exists a ψ_0 , such that $E_0(\psi_0) < 0$ for $\xi \in \mathbb{A}^g$.

Let $\xi \notin \mathbb{A}^g \cup \{\mathbf{0}\}$, then ξ can be divided by two cases: (i) $|M\xi_1|/|\xi| \in (0, M_c)$ with $|\xi| \geq S(\xi)$, and (ii) $|M\xi_1|/|\xi| \geq M_c$ if $M_c < \infty$ (noting that this case will not appear if $M_c = \infty$). For the first case, in view of the definition of (2.14), we find that

$$|\xi|^2 E_0(\psi) = |\xi|^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left[(M\xi_1)^2 \left(|\psi|^2 + \frac{|\psi'|^2}{|\xi|^2} \right) - g\bar{\rho}'\psi^2 \right] dx_3 \geq 0 \quad \text{for any } \psi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}).$$

Finally, for the second case, by the definition of (1.8), we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\frac{(M\xi_1)^2}{|\xi|^2} |\psi'|^2 - g\bar{\rho}'\psi^2 \right) dx_3 \geq 0 \quad \text{for any } \psi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}),$$

which yields

$$|\xi|^2 E_0 = |\xi|^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left[(M\xi_1)^2 \left(|\psi|^2 + \frac{|\psi'|^2}{|\xi|^2} \right) - g\bar{\rho}'\psi^2 \right] dx_3 \geq 0 \quad \text{for any } \psi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}).$$

Summarizing the above discussions, we see that $|\xi|^2 E_0(\psi) \geq 0$ for any $\psi \in H^1(\mathbb{R})$ if $\xi \notin \mathbb{A}^g \cup \{\mathbf{0}\}$. This completes the proof for the horizontal case. $\square$

2.2. Solutions to the variational problem

In this subsection we show that a minimizer of (2.13) exists for the case of $\inf_{\mathcal{A}} E(\psi, s) < 0$ which will be shown to be true for sufficiently small s in Proposition 2.5 below, and that the corresponding Euler-Lagrange equations are equivalent to (2.7), (2.8).

Proposition 2.4. *For any fixed $s > 0$ and ξ with $|\xi| \neq 0$, we have*

- (1) $\inf_{\psi \in \mathcal{A}} E(\psi, s) > -\infty$.
- (2) if there exists a $\bar{\psi} \in \mathcal{A}$, such that $E(\bar{\psi}) < 0$, then $E(\psi)$ achieves its infimum on $\mathcal{A}$.
- (3) let $\tilde{\psi}$ be a minimizer and $-\lambda^2 := E(\tilde{\psi})$, then the pair $(\tilde{\psi}, \lambda^2)$ satisfies (2.7), (2.8). Moreover, $\tilde{\psi} \in H^\infty(\mathbb{R}) := \cap_{k=0}^\infty H^k(\mathbb{R})$.

PROOF. We only show the proposition for the horizontal case, the vertical case can be dealt with in the same manner.

- (1) Noticing that for any $\psi \in \mathcal{A}$,

$$E(\psi) \geq -g|\xi|^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}} \bar{\rho}'\psi^2 dx_3 \geq -g \left\| \frac{\bar{\rho}'}{\bar{\rho}} \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \bar{\rho}|\xi|^2 \psi^2 dx_3 \geq -g \left\| \frac{\bar{\rho}'}{\bar{\rho}} \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}, \quad (2.21)$$

we see that E is bounded from below on $\mathcal{A}$ by virtue of (1.2). This proves (1).

(2) We proceed to show (2). Let $\psi_n \in \mathcal{A}$ be a minimizing sequence, then $E(\psi_n)$ is bounded. This together with (2.9) and (2.21) implies that ψ_n is bounded in $H^2(\mathbb{R})$. So, there exists a

$\psi_0 \in H^2(\mathbb{R})$, such that $\psi_n \rightarrow \psi_0$ weakly in $H^2(\mathbb{R})$ and strongly in $H_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R})$. Moreover, by the lower semi-continuity, (1.2) and the assumption that $E(\bar{\psi}) < 0$ for some $\bar{\psi} \in \mathcal{A}$, we deduce that

$$E(\psi_0) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} E(\psi_n) = \inf_{\psi \in \mathcal{A}} E(\psi) < 0, \quad \text{and} \quad 0 < J(\psi_0) \leq 1.$$

Suppose by contradiction that $J(\psi_0) < 1$. By the homogeneity of J we may find an $\alpha > 1$ so that $J(\alpha\psi_0) = 1$, i.e., we may scale up ψ_0 so that $\alpha\psi_0 \in \mathcal{A}$. From this we deduce that

$$E(\alpha\psi_0) = \alpha^2 E(\psi_0) \leq \alpha^2 \inf_{\mathcal{A}} E < \inf_{\mathcal{A}} E < 0,$$

which is a contradiction since $\alpha\psi_0 \in \mathcal{A}$. Hence $J(\psi_0) = 1$ and $\psi_0 \in \mathcal{A}$. This shows that $E(\psi)$ achieves its infimum on $\mathcal{A}$.

(3) Finally we prove (3). Notice that since $E(\psi)$ and $J(\psi)$ are homogeneous of degree 2, (2.13) is equivalent to

$$\alpha(s) = \inf_{\psi \in H^2(\mathbb{R}), \psi \neq 0} \frac{E(\psi)}{J(\psi)}. \quad (2.22)$$

For any $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\psi \in H^2(\mathbb{R})$ we take $\psi(\tau) := \tilde{\psi} + \tau\psi$, then (2.22) implies

$$E(\psi(\tau)) + \lambda^2 J(\psi(\tau)) \geq 0.$$

If we set $I(\tau) = E(\psi(\tau)) + \lambda^2 J(\psi(\tau))$, then $I(\tau) \geq 0$ for all $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and $I(0) = 0$. This implies $I'(0) = 0$. By virtue of (2.9) and (2.10), a direct computation leads to

$$\begin{aligned} s\mu \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(4|\xi|^2 \tilde{\psi}'\psi' + (|\xi|^2 \tilde{\psi} + \tilde{\psi}'')(|\xi|^2 \psi + \psi'') + (M\xi_1)^2 (|\xi|^2 \tilde{\psi}\psi + \tilde{\psi}'\psi') \right) dx_3 \\ = g|\xi|^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{\rho}' \tilde{\psi} \psi dx_3 - \lambda^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{\rho} (|\xi|^2 \tilde{\psi}\psi + \tilde{\psi}'\psi') dx_3, \end{aligned} \quad (2.23)$$

where we have used the upper boundedness of $\tilde{\rho}$.

By further assuming that ψ is compactly supported in $\mathbb{R}$, we find that $\tilde{\psi}$ satisfies the equation (2.8) in the weak sense on $\mathbb{R}$ for the horizontal case. In order to improve the regularity of $\tilde{\psi}$, we rewrite (2.23) as

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{\psi}'' \psi'' dx_3 &= \frac{1}{s\mu} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(g|\xi|^2 \tilde{\rho}' \tilde{\psi} - \lambda^2 (|\xi|^2 \tilde{\rho} \tilde{\psi} - (\tilde{\rho} \tilde{\psi}')') \right. \\ &\quad \left. + s\mu (2|\xi|^2 \tilde{\psi}'' - |\xi|^4 \tilde{\psi}) + (M\xi_1)^2 (\tilde{\psi}'' - |\xi|^2 \tilde{\psi}) \right) \psi dx_3 \\ &:= \int_{\mathbb{R}} f \psi dx_3. \end{aligned} \quad (2.24)$$

For any $n \geq 1$, let $\psi_{1,n}, \psi_2 \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ satisfy $\psi_{1,n}(x_3) \equiv 1$ for $|x_3| \leq n$. If one takes $\psi = \psi_{1,n} \int_{-\infty}^{x_3} \psi_2 dy$ in (2.24), then one has

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\psi_{1,n} \tilde{\psi}'') \psi_2' dx_3 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(f \psi_{1,n} \int_{-\infty}^{x_3} \psi_2 dy - \psi_{1,n}'' \psi'' \int_{-\infty}^{x_3} \psi_2 dy - 2\psi_{1,n}' \tilde{\psi}'' \psi_2 \right) dx_3 \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\int_{x_3}^{+\infty} (f \psi_{1,n} - \psi_{1,n}'' \tilde{\psi}'') dy - 2\psi_{1,n}' \tilde{\psi}'' \right) \psi_2 dx_3, \end{aligned}$$

which, recalling $\tilde{\psi} \in H^2(\mathbb{R})$, implies $\tilde{\psi}'' \in H_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R})$ and

$$\tilde{\psi}''' = (\psi_{1,n}\psi'')' = \int_{x_3}^{+\infty} (f\psi_{1,n} - \psi_{1,n}'')\tilde{\psi}'' dy \quad \text{for any } x_3 \text{ with } |x_3| \leq n.$$

Integrating by parts, we can rewrite (2.24) as

$$\begin{aligned} - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{\psi}''' \psi' dx_3 &= \frac{1}{s\mu} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(g|\xi|^2 \bar{\rho}' \tilde{\psi} - \lambda^2 (|\xi|^2 \bar{\rho} \tilde{\psi} - (\bar{\rho} \tilde{\psi}')') \right. \\ &\quad \left. + s\mu(2|\xi|^2 \tilde{\psi}'' - |\xi|^4 \tilde{\psi}) + (M\xi_1)^2 (\tilde{\psi}'' - |\xi|^2 \tilde{\psi}) \right) \psi dx_3, \end{aligned}$$

which, keeping in mind that $\tilde{\psi} \in H^2(\mathbb{R})$, yields $\tilde{\psi}''' \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$. Hence $\tilde{\psi} \in H_{\text{loc}}^4(\mathbb{R}) \cap C_{\text{loc}}^{3,1/2}(\mathbb{R})$, and $\tilde{\psi}'(\infty) = \tilde{\psi}''(\infty) = \tilde{\psi}'''(\infty) = 0$. Using these facts, Hölder's inequality, and integration by parts, we conclude that

$$\|\tilde{\psi}'''\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\tilde{\psi}'''|^2 dx_3 = - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{\psi}'' \tilde{\psi}'''' dx_3 \leq \|\tilde{\psi}''\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \|\tilde{\psi}''''\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})},$$

i.e., $\tilde{\psi}''' \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$. Consequently, $\tilde{\psi} \in H^4(\mathbb{R})$ solves (2.7), (2.8). This immediately gives $\tilde{\psi} \in H^\infty(\mathbb{R})$. $\square$

Next, we want to show that there is a fixed point such that $\lambda = s$. To this end, we first give some properties of $\alpha(s)$ as a function of $s > 0$.

Proposition 2.5. *The function $\alpha(s)$ defined on $(0, \infty)$ enjoys the following properties:*

- (1) $\alpha(s) \in C_{\text{loc}}^{0,1}(0, \infty)$ is nondecreasing.
- (2) for any $\xi \in \mathbb{A}^g$, there exist constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ depending on $g, M, \bar{\rho}, \mu$, and ξ , such that

$$\alpha(s) \leq -c_1 + sc_2. \quad (2.25)$$

PROOF. We still give the proof for the horizontal case only, and the vertical case can be dealt with in the same way.

(1) Let $\{\psi_{s_2}^n\} \subset \mathcal{A}$ be a minimizing sequence of $\inf_{\psi \in \mathcal{A}} E(\psi, s_2)$. From (2.9) and (2.12) it follows that

$$\alpha(s_1) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E(\psi_{s_2}^n, s_1) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E(\psi_{s_2}^n, s_2) = \alpha(s_2) \quad \text{for any } 0 < s_1 < s_2 < \infty.$$

Hence $\alpha(s)$ is nondecreasing on $(0, \infty)$. Next we shall use this fact to show the continuity of $\alpha(s)$.

Let $I := [a, b] \subset \mathbb{R}^+$ be a bounded interval. In view of (2.21) and the monotonicity of $\alpha(s)$, we know that

$$|\alpha(s)| \leq \max \left\{ |\alpha(b)|, g \|\bar{\rho}'/\bar{\rho}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \right\} < \infty \quad \text{for any } s \in I. \quad (2.26)$$

On the other hand, for any $s \in I$, there exists a minimizing sequence $\{\psi_s^n\} \subset \mathcal{A}$ of $\inf_{\psi \in \mathcal{A}} E(\psi, s)$, such that

$$|\alpha(s) - E(\psi_s^n, s)| < 1.$$

Making use of (2.9)–(2.12) and (2.26), we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq E_1(\psi_s^n, s) &= \frac{E(\psi_s^n, s)}{s} + \frac{g|\xi|^2}{s} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \bar{\rho}' \psi^2 dx_3 - \frac{(M\xi_1)^2}{s} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (|\xi|^2 |\psi|^2 + |\psi'|^2) dx_3 \\ &\leq \frac{1 + \max\{|\alpha(b)|, g \|\bar{\rho}'/\bar{\rho}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}\}}{a} + \frac{g}{a} \left\| \frac{\bar{\rho}'}{\bar{\rho}} \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} := K. \end{aligned}$$

For $s_i \in I$ ($i = 1, 2$), we further find that

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(s_1) &\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E(\varphi_{s_2}^n, s_1) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E(\psi_{s_2}^n, s_2) + |s_1 - s_2| \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_1(\psi_{s_2}^n) \\ &\leq \alpha(s_2) + K|s_1 - s_2|. \end{aligned} \quad (2.27)$$

Reversing the role of the indices 1 and 2 in the derivation of the inequality (2.27), we obtain the same boundedness with the indices switched. Therefore, we have

$$|\alpha(s_1) - \alpha(s_2)| \leq K|s_1 - s_2|,$$

which yields $\alpha(s) \in C_{\text{loc}}^{0,1}(0, \infty)$.

(2) Since $\xi \in \mathbb{A}^g$, by virtue of Proposition 2.3, there exists a $\bar{\psi} \in H^1(\mathbb{R})$, such that

$$E_0(\psi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} (M\xi_1)^2 \left(|\bar{\psi}|^2 + \frac{|\bar{\psi}'|^2}{|\xi|^2} \right) - g\bar{\rho}'\bar{\psi}^2 dx_3 < 0. \quad (2.28)$$

On the other hand, $H^2(\mathbb{R})$ is dense in $H^1(\mathbb{R})$, thus there is a function sequence $\bar{\psi}_n \in H^2(\mathbb{R})$, so that

$$\bar{\psi}_n \rightarrow \bar{\psi} \quad \text{strongly in } H^1(\mathbb{R}). \quad (2.29)$$

Putting (2.28) and (2.29) together, we see that there is a subsequence $\bar{\psi}_{n_0} \in H^2(\mathbb{R})$, such that $\bar{\psi}_{n_0} \not\equiv 0$ and

$$E_0(\bar{\psi}_{n_0}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left[(M\xi_1)^2 \left(|\bar{\psi}_{n_0}|^2 + \frac{|\bar{\psi}_{n_0}'|^2}{|\xi|^2} \right) - g\bar{\rho}'\bar{\psi}_{n_0}^2 \right] dx_3 < 0.$$

Thus, we have

$$\alpha(s) = \inf_{\psi \in \mathcal{A}} E(\psi) = \inf_{\psi \in H^2(\mathbb{R})} \frac{E(\psi)}{J(\psi)} \leq \frac{E(\bar{\psi}_{n_0})}{J(\bar{\psi}_{n_0})} = |\xi|^2 \frac{E_0(\bar{\psi}_{n_0})}{J(\bar{\psi}_{n_0})} + s \frac{E_1(\bar{\psi}_{n_0})}{J(\bar{\psi}_{n_0})} := -c_1 + sc_2$$

for two positive constants $c_1 := c_1(g, M, \bar{\rho}, |\xi|)$ and $c_2 := c_2(g, M, \mu, \bar{\rho}, |\xi|)$. This completes the proof for the vertical case. $\square$

Given $\xi \in \mathbb{A}^g$, by virtue of (2.25), there exists a $s_0 > 0$ depending on the quantities $g, M, \mu, \bar{\rho}$ and ξ , such that for any $s \in (0, s_0]$, $\alpha(s) < 0$. Let

$$\mathfrak{S}_\xi := \sup\{s \mid \alpha(\tau) < 0 \text{ for any } \tau \in (0, s)\}, \quad (2.30)$$

then $\mathfrak{S}_\xi > 0$. This allows us to define $\lambda(s) = \sqrt{-\alpha(s)} > 0$ for any $s \in \mathcal{S}_\xi := (0, \mathfrak{S}_\xi)$. Therefore, as a result of Proposition 2.4, we have the following existence for the modified problem (2.7), (2.8).

Proposition 2.6. *For each $\xi \in \mathbb{A}^g$ and $s \in \mathcal{S}_\xi$ there is a solution $\psi = \psi(\xi, x_3) \not\equiv 0$ with $\lambda = \lambda(\xi, s) > 0$ to the problem (2.7), (2.8). Moreover, $\psi \in H^\infty(\mathbb{R}) \cap \mathcal{A}$.*

Now, we can use Proposition 2.5, (2.21) and (2.30) to find that $\lambda(s) \in C_{\text{loc}}^{0,1}(\mathcal{S}_\xi)$ is nonincreasing, $\lambda(s) \leq \sqrt{g} \|\sqrt{\bar{\rho}'/\bar{\rho}}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}$, $\lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \lambda(s) > 0$ and $\lim_{s \rightarrow \mathfrak{S}_\xi} \lambda(s) = 0$ if $\mathfrak{S}_{|\xi|} < +\infty$. Hence, we can employ a fixed-point argument to find $s \in \mathcal{S}_\xi$ so that $s = \lambda(\xi, s)$, and thus obtain a solution to the original problem (2.6), (2.7).

Proposition 2.7. *Let $\xi \in \mathbb{A}^g$, then there exists a unique $s \in \mathcal{S}_\xi$, such that $\lambda(\xi, s) = \sqrt{-\alpha(s)} > 0$ and $s = \lambda(\xi, s)$.*

PROOF. We refer to [10, Theorem 3.8] (or [30, Lemma 3.7]) for a proof. $\square$

Moreover, in view of Propositions 2.6 and 2.7, we conclude the following existence for the problem (2.6)–(2.7).

Theorem 2.1. *For each $\xi \in \mathbb{A}^g$, there exist $\psi = \psi(\xi, x_3) \not\equiv 0$ and $\lambda(\xi) > 0$ satisfying (2.6) and (2.7). Moreover, $\psi \in H^\infty(\mathbb{R}) \cap \mathcal{A}$.*

We end this subsection by giving additional properties of the solutions established in Theorem 2.1 in terms of $\lambda(\xi)$, which show that λ is a bounded, continuous function of ξ .

Proposition 2.8. *The positive function $\lambda : \mathbb{A}^g \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is continuous and satisfies*

$$\sup_{\xi \in \mathbb{A}^g} \lambda(\xi) \leq \sqrt{g \|\bar{\rho}'/\bar{\rho}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}}. \quad (2.31)$$

PROOF. The boundedness of λ in (2.31) follows from (2.21). As for the proof of the continuity of λ , we still give the proof for the horizontal case only.

First, let $\xi_0 \in \mathcal{A}$ be arbitrary but fixed, and $\xi \rightarrow \xi_0$. Without loss of generality, assume $\xi \in \mathbb{A}^g$, since $\mathbb{A}^g$ is an open set by Proposition 2.2. Then there exists an interval $[a, b] \subset \mathbb{R}^+$ so that $|\xi|$ and $|\xi_0| \in (a, b)$. Let $\delta = |\xi|^2 - |\xi_0|^2$, then $\delta \rightarrow 0$ as $|\xi| \rightarrow |\xi_0|$.

(i) We begin with the proof of the following conclusion:

$$\lim_{\xi \rightarrow \xi_0} \alpha(\xi, s) = \alpha(\xi_0, s) \quad \text{for any } s \in \mathcal{S}_\xi. \quad (2.32)$$

By virtue of Proposition 2.6, for any $\xi \in \mathbb{A}^g$, there exists a function $\psi_\xi \in \mathcal{A}$, such that

$$\alpha(\xi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left[s\mu(4|\xi|^2|\psi'_\xi|^2 + |\xi|^2\psi_\xi + \psi''_\xi)^2 + (M\xi_1)^2 (|\xi|^2|\psi_\xi|^2 + |\psi'_\xi|^2) - g|\xi|^2\bar{\rho}'\psi_\xi^2 \right] dx_3 < 0, \quad (2.33)$$

which, together with (2.10), yields

$$\|\psi_\xi\|_{H^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq c_3, \quad (2.34)$$

where c_3 depends on $g, M, \mu, \bar{\rho}, a, b$ and s .

To deal with the term involved with $|\xi_1|$, we denote $\delta_1 := |\xi_1|^2 - |\xi_{01}|^2$. Substitution of $|\xi|^2 = |\xi_0|^2 + \delta$ and $|\xi_1|^2 = |\xi_{01}|^2 + \delta_1$ into (2.33) results in

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(\xi) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left[s\mu(4|\xi_0|^2|\psi'_\xi|^2 + |\xi_0|^2\psi_\xi + \psi''_\xi)^2 + (M\xi_{01})^2 (|\xi_0|^2|\psi_\xi|^2 + |\psi'_\xi|^2) - g|\xi_0|^2\bar{\rho}'\psi_\xi^2 \right] dx_3 \\ &\quad + \delta f(\delta, \psi_\xi) + \delta_1 h(\psi_\xi) \geq \alpha(\xi_0) + \delta f(\delta, \psi_\xi) + \delta_1 h(\psi_\xi), \end{aligned} \quad (2.35)$$

where

$$f(\delta, \psi_\xi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left[s\mu(4|\psi'_\xi|^2 + 2\delta\psi_\xi(|\xi_0|^2\psi_\xi + \psi''_\xi) + \delta\psi_\xi^2 + (M\xi_{01})^2|\psi_\xi|^2 - g\bar{\rho}'\psi_\xi^2) \right] dx_3$$

and

$$h(\delta, \psi_\xi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} M^2 ((|\xi_0|^2 + \delta)|\psi_\xi|^2 + |\psi'_\xi|^2) dx_3.$$

By Hölder's inequality and (2.34), we can bound

$$|f(\delta, \psi_\xi)| + |h(\delta, \psi_\xi)| \leq c_4 \quad \text{for some constant } c_4. \quad (2.36)$$

Similar to (2.35) and (2.36), we also have

$$\alpha(\xi_0) \geq \alpha(\xi) - \delta f(-\delta, \psi_{\xi_0}) - \delta_1 h(\psi_{\xi_0}) \quad (2.37)$$

and

$$|f(-\delta, \psi_{\xi_0})| + |h(-\delta, \psi_{\xi_0})| \leq c_5. \quad (2.38)$$

Combining (2.35) with (2.37), we get

$$\delta f(-\delta, \psi_{\xi_0}) + \delta_1 h(\psi_{\xi_0}) \geq \alpha(\xi) - \alpha(\xi_0) \geq \delta f(\delta, \psi_\xi) + \delta_1 h(\psi_\xi),$$

which, together with (2.36) and (2.38), implies (2.32). Hence,

$$\lim_{\xi \rightarrow \xi_0} \lambda(\xi, s) = \lambda(\xi_0, s) \quad \text{for any } s \in \mathcal{S}_\xi, \quad (2.39)$$

because of $\lambda(\xi, s) = \sqrt{-\alpha(\xi, s)}$.

(ii) In view of (2.39) and Proposition 2.7, we see that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that $|\lambda(\xi, s_{\xi_0}) - \lambda(\xi_0, s_{\xi_0})| < \varepsilon$ and $s_{\xi_0} = \lambda(\xi_0, s_{\xi_0}) = \sqrt{-\alpha(\xi_0, s_{\xi_0})}$ for any $\xi \in B_{\xi_0}^\delta := \{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid |\mathbf{y} - \xi_0| < \delta\} \subset \mathbb{A}^g$. On the other hand, for each $|\xi| > 0$, $\lambda(s)$ is nonincreasing and continuous on $\mathcal{S}_\xi$, and there exists a unique $s_\xi \in \mathcal{S}_\xi$ satisfying $\lambda(\xi, s_\xi) = s_\xi > 0$ by Proposition 2.7. Consequently, we immediately infer that $|\lambda(\xi, s_\xi) - \lambda(\xi_0, s_{\xi_0})| < \varepsilon$ with $s_\xi = \lambda(\xi, s_\xi)$. Therefore, $\lambda(\xi)$ is continuous. This completes the proof of the proposition. $\square$

2.3. Construction of a solution to the system (2.4), (2.5)

A solution to (2.6), (2.7) gives rise to a solution of the ODEs (2.4), (2.5) for the growing mode velocity $\mathbf{u}$ as well.

Theorem 2.2. *For each $\xi \in \mathbb{A}^g$, there exists a solution $(\varphi, \theta, \psi, \pi) := (\varphi, \theta, \psi, \pi)(\xi, x_3)$ with $\lambda = \lambda(\xi) > 0$ to (2.4), (2.5), and the solution belongs to $H^\infty(\mathbb{R})$. Moreover $\psi \in \mathcal{A}$.*

PROOF. We still give the proof for the horizontal case only. First, in view of Theorem 2.1, we have a solution $(\psi, \lambda) := (\psi(\xi, x_3), \lambda(\xi))$ satisfying (2.6), (2.7). Moreover, $\lambda > 0$ and $\psi \in \mathcal{A} \cap H^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Then, multiplying (2.4)₁ and (2.4)₂ by ξ_1 and ξ_2 respectively, adding the resulting equations, and utilizing (2.4)₄, we find that π can be expressed by ψ , i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \pi &= \pi(\xi, x_3) \\ &= [-\lambda\mu(\xi_1\varphi + \xi_2\theta)'' + (\lambda^2\bar{\rho} + \lambda\mu|\xi|^2 + M^2\xi_1^2)(\xi_1\varphi + \xi_2\theta) - M^2\xi_1|\xi|^2\varphi]/(\lambda|\xi|^2) \\ &= [\lambda\mu\psi''' - (\lambda^2\bar{\rho} + \lambda\mu|\xi|^2 + M^2\xi_1^2)\psi' - M^2\xi_1|\xi|^2\varphi]/(\lambda|\xi|^2). \end{aligned} \quad (2.40)$$

Thus (2.4)₁ can be rewritten as

$$-\varphi'' + \sigma\varphi = \omega \quad (2.41)$$

with boundary conditions

$$\varphi(-\infty) = \varphi(+\infty) = 0, \quad (2.42)$$

where $\sigma = (\lambda^2\bar{\rho} + \lambda\mu|\xi|^2 + M^2\xi_1^2)/(\lambda\mu) > 0$ and $\omega = \xi_1[\lambda\mu\psi''' - (\lambda^2\bar{\rho} + \lambda\mu|\xi|^2 + M^2\xi_1^2)\psi']/(\lambda\mu|\xi|^2) \in H^\infty(\mathbb{R})$. By the ODE theory on a bounded interval and the domain expansion technique, we

can obtain a unique solution $\varphi := \varphi(\xi, x_3) \in H^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ to (2.41), (2.42). In view of (2.40), thus π can be uniquely determined by the known functions ψ and φ . Employing arguments similar to those in the construction of φ , we can obtain a unique solution $\theta := \theta(\xi, x_3) \in H^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ to (2.4)₃ with $\theta(-\infty) = \theta(+\infty) = 0$, where the solution θ depends on the known functions π and φ .

Finally, by a simple computation, we can check that $(\varphi, \theta, \psi, \pi)$ with λ constructed as above indeed is a solution to (2.4), (2.5). $\square$

Remark 2.1. For each x_3 , it is easy to see that the solution $(\varphi(\xi, \cdot), \theta(\xi, \cdot), \psi(\xi, \cdot), \pi(\xi, \cdot), \lambda(\xi))$ constructed in Theorem 2.2 possesses the following properties:

- (1) $\lambda(\xi)$, $\psi(\xi, \cdot)$ and $\pi(\xi, \cdot)$ are even on ξ_1 or ξ_2 , when another variable is fixed;
- (2) $\varphi(\xi, \cdot)$ is odd on ξ_1 , but even on ξ_2 , when another variable is fixed;
- (3) $\theta(\xi, \cdot)$ is even on ξ_1 , but odd on ξ_2 , when another variable is fixed.

Remark 2.2. We mention that the system (2.4), (2.5) for the vertical case enjoys rotational structure. Hence, we can also use the rotation method as in [16] to construct a solution of (2.4), (2.5), which is simpler than the above construction process.

The next lemma provides an estimate for the $H^k(\mathbb{R})$ -norm of the solution $(\varphi, \theta, \psi, \pi)$ with ξ varying, which will be useful in the next subsection. To emphasize the dependence on ξ , we write these solutions as $(\varphi, \theta, \psi, \pi)(\xi) := (\varphi, \theta, \psi, \pi)(\xi, x_3)$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $k \geq 0$, and $\mathbb{D} \subset \mathbb{A}^g$ be a nonempty bounded set satisfying the closure $\bar{\mathbb{D}} \subset \mathbb{A}^g$. Then for any $\xi \in \mathbb{D}$ there are positive constants A_k, B_k, C_k and D_k , which may depend on $g, M, \mu, \bar{\rho}$ and $\mathbb{D}$, such that*

$$\|\psi(\xi)\|_{H^k(\mathbb{R})} \leq A_k, \quad (2.43)$$

$$\|\varphi(\xi)\|_{H^k(\mathbb{R})} \leq B_k, \quad (2.44)$$

$$\|\theta(\xi)\|_{H^k(\mathbb{R})} \leq C_k, \quad (2.45)$$

$$\|\pi(\xi)\|_{H^k(\mathbb{R})} \leq D_k, \quad (2.46)$$

where $(\varphi, \theta, \psi, \pi)(\xi)$ and $\lambda(\xi)$ be constructed as in Theorem 2.2. Moreover,

$$\|\psi(\xi)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 > 0. \quad (2.47)$$

PROOF. We still give the proof for the horizontal case only. Throughout this proof, we denote by $\tilde{c}$ a generic positive constant which may vary from line to line, and may depend on $g, M, \mu, \bar{\rho}$ and $\mathbb{D}$.

We begin with the estimate (2.43). We first rewrite (2.6) as

$$\begin{aligned} \psi''''(\xi) = & [(\lambda^2 \bar{\rho} + 2\lambda\mu|\xi|^2 + (M\xi_1)^2)\psi''(\xi) + \lambda^2 \bar{\rho}'\psi'(\xi) \\ & - |\xi|^2(\lambda^2 \bar{\rho} + \lambda\mu|\xi|^2 + (M\xi_1)^2 - g\bar{\rho}')\psi(\xi)]/\lambda\mu, \end{aligned} \quad (2.48)$$

which yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi''(\xi)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} = & (\lambda\mu)^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} [\lambda(\lambda\bar{\rho} + 2\mu|\xi|^2 + (M\xi_1)^2)\psi''(\xi) + \lambda^2 \bar{\rho}'\psi'(\xi) \\ & - |\xi|^2(\lambda^2 \bar{\rho} + \lambda\mu|\xi|^2 + (M\xi_1)^2 - g\bar{\rho}')\psi(\xi)] \psi(\xi) dx_3 \end{aligned} \quad (2.49)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi'''(\xi)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} = & -(\lambda\mu)^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} [\lambda(\lambda\bar{\rho} + 2\mu|\xi|^2 + (M\xi_1)^2)\psi''(\xi) + \lambda^2\bar{\rho}'\psi'(\xi) \\ & - |\xi|^2(\lambda^2\bar{\rho} + \lambda\mu|\xi|^2 + (M\xi_1)^2 - g\bar{\rho}')\psi(\xi)]\psi''(\xi)dx_3. \end{aligned} \quad (2.50)$$

Noting that since $\psi \in \mathcal{A}$, the inequality (2.47) holds, and there is a constant $\tilde{c}$, such that

$$\|\psi(\xi)\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})} \leq \tilde{c}. \quad (2.51)$$

On the other hand, in view of Proposition 2.8, we have

$$\lambda(\xi) \geq \tilde{c} > 0 \quad \text{for any } \xi \in \mathbb{D}. \quad (2.52)$$

Thus, using Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality, (2.51) and (2.52), we deduce from (2.49) and (2.50) that

$$\|\psi''(\xi)\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})} \leq \tilde{c},$$

whence, by (2.48),

$$\|\psi(\xi)\|_{H^4(\mathbb{R})} \leq \tilde{c}. \quad (2.53)$$

Consequently, differentiating (2.48) with respect to x_3 and using (2.53), we find, by induction on k , that (2.43) holds for any $k \geq 0$.

Now we turn to the estimate of (2.44). From (2.41), we have

$$\|\varphi'\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 + \sigma\|\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \omega\varphi dx_3,$$

which, together with Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality and (2.43), yields

$$\|\varphi\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})}^2 \leq \tilde{c}.$$

We further deduce from (2.41) that

$$\|\varphi\|_{H^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 \leq \tilde{c}. \quad (2.54)$$

Thus, we can employ (2.54) and (2.41) to deduce that (2.44) holds for any $k \geq 0$. Using this fact, the estimates (2.43) and (2.44), the expression of π in (2.40) implies (2.46). Finally, similar to the deduction of (2.44), we can show that (2.45) holds. This completes the proof. $\square$

2.4. Exponential growth rate

In this subsection we will construct a linear real-valued solution to the linearized problem (1.7) along with (1.6) which grows in-time in the Sobolev space of order k .

Theorem 2.3. *Let*

$$\Lambda = \sup_{\xi \in \mathbb{A}^g \cap (L^{-1}\mathbb{Z})^2} \lambda(\xi), \quad (2.55)$$

then there exist a positive constant $\Lambda^* \in (\Lambda/2, \Lambda)$, and a real-valued solution $(\varrho, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{N}, q)$ to the linearized problem (1.7) along with (1.6), such that

(1) *For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\|(\varrho, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{N}, q)(0)\|_{H^k} < \infty \quad (2.56)$$

(2) For every $t > 0$, $(\varrho, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{N}, q)(t) \in H^k$, and

$$e^{\Lambda^* t} \|(\varrho, \mathbf{N}, q)(0)\|_{H^k} = \|(\varrho, \mathbf{N}, q)(t)\|_{H^k} = e^{t\Lambda^*} \|(\varrho, \mathbf{N}, q)(0)\|_{H^k}, \quad (2.57)$$

$$e^{\Lambda^* t} \|u_i(0)\|_{H^k} = \|u_i(t)\|_{H^k} = e^{t\Lambda^*} \|u_i(0)\|_{H^k}, \quad i = 1, 2, 3. \quad (2.58)$$

(3) In addition,

$$\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}(0) = \operatorname{div} \mathbf{N}(0) = 0, \quad (2.59)$$

and

$$\|u_3(0)\|_{L^2} > 0. \quad (2.60)$$

Remark 2.3. In view of the third conclusion in Proposition 2.2 and (2.31), we see that

$$0 < \Lambda \leq \sup_{\xi \in \mathbb{A}^g} \lambda(\xi) \leq \sqrt{g \|\bar{\rho}'/\bar{\rho}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}}.$$

PROOF. Let

$$\mathbf{v}(\xi, x_3) = -i\varphi(\xi, x_3)\mathbf{e}_1 - i\theta(\xi, x_3)\mathbf{e}_2 + \psi(\xi, x_3)\mathbf{e}_3,$$

where (φ, θ, ψ) with an associated growth rate $\lambda(\xi)$ is constructed in Theorem 2.2 for any given $\xi \in \mathbb{A}^g$. Recalling the definition of supremum, and using Proposition 2.2, we find that there exist ξ^1 and $\xi^2 := -\xi^1$ such that

$$\Lambda^* := \lambda(\xi^1) = \lambda(\xi^2) \in (\Lambda/2, \Lambda) \text{ and } \xi^i \in \mathbb{A}^g \text{ for } i = 1 \text{ and } 2.$$

In view of Remark 2.1,

$$\begin{cases} \varrho(t, \mathbf{x}) = -e^{\Lambda^* t} \bar{\rho}' \sum_{m=1}^2 v_3(\xi^m, x_3) e^{i\mathbf{x}' \cdot \xi^m}, \\ \mathbf{u}(t, \mathbf{x}) = \Lambda^* e^{\Lambda^* t} \sum_{m=1}^2 \mathbf{v}(\xi^m, x_3) e^{i\mathbf{x}' \cdot \xi^m}, \\ q(t, \mathbf{x}) = \Lambda^* e^{\Lambda^* t} \sum_{m=1}^2 \pi(\xi^m, x_3) e^{i\mathbf{x}' \cdot \xi^m}, \\ \mathbf{N}(t, \mathbf{x}) = e^{\Lambda^* t} \sum_{m=1}^2 \bar{\mathbf{M}} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} (\mathbf{v}(\xi^m, x_3) e^{i\mathbf{x}' \cdot \xi^m}) \end{cases} \quad (2.61)$$

gives a real-value solution to (1.5)–(1.7) satisfying (2.57)–(2.59). Lemma 2.1 immediately implies that $(\varrho, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{N}, q)$ constructed in (2.61) also satisfies (2.56). Finally, thanks to (2.47), we get

$$\|u_3(0)\|_{L^2}^2 = 2\Lambda^* \int_{\mathbb{R}} \psi^2(\xi^1, x_3) dx_3 \int_{(2\pi L\mathbb{T})^2} \cos^2(\mathbf{x}' \cdot \xi^1) d\mathbf{x}' > 0.$$

Hence (2.60) holds. This completes the proof of Theorem 2.3. $\square$

Remark 2.4. When $\bar{\mathbf{M}} = M\mathbf{e}_3$, recalling the expression of $\mathbf{M}$, one gets from a simple computation that

$$\|N_3(t)\|_{L^2}^2 = e^{2\Lambda^* t} \|N_3(0)\|_{L^2}^2 = 4M^2 e^{2\Lambda^* t} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\partial_{x_3} \psi(\xi^1, x_3))^2 dx_3 \int_{(2\pi L\mathbb{T})^2} \cos^2(\mathbf{x}' \cdot \xi^1) d\mathbf{x}'.$$

On the other hand, thanks to (2.47) and $\psi \in H^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, we have $\partial_{x_3} \psi(\xi^1, x_3) \not\equiv 0$. Consequently,

$$\|N_3(t)\|_{L^2} = e^{\Lambda^* t} \|N_3(0)\|_{L^2} > 0 \quad \text{for any } t \geq 0. \quad (2.62)$$

3. Sharp growth rate of the linear solutions

In this section, we will show that Λ defined by (2.55) is the sharp growth rate of arbitrary solutions to the linearized problem (1.7). Since the density varies, the spectrum of the linear operator is difficult to analyze, and it is hard to obtain the largest growth rate of the solution operator in some Sobolev space in the usual way. Instead, motivated by [10], we use energy estimates to show that $e^{\Lambda t}$ is the sharp growth rate. First, we have the following energy identity.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $(\varrho, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{N}, q)$ solve the problem (1.6), (1.7) with $\bar{\mathbf{M}} = \bar{\mathbf{M}}_i$ ($i = 1, 2$). Then,*

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} (\bar{\rho} |\mathbf{u}_t|^2 + M^2 |\partial_i \mathbf{u}|^2 - g \bar{\rho}' u_3^2) d\mathbf{x} + 2\mu \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \partial_t \mathbf{u}|^2 d\mathbf{x} = 0. \quad (3.1)$$

PROOF. We differentiate (1.7) in time, multiply the resulting equation by $\mathbf{u}_t$ and then integrate by part over Ω . Using the first and third equations in (1.7), we obtain (3.1). $\square$

The next lemma allows us to estimate the energy in terms of Λ .

Lemma 3.2. *Let a real-value function $\mathbf{u} \in H^1$ with $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} = 0$, then*

$$\int_{\Omega} (g \bar{\rho}' |u_3|^2 - M^2 |\partial_i \mathbf{u}|^2) d\mathbf{x} \leq \Lambda^2 \int_{\Omega} \bar{\rho} |\mathbf{u}|^2 d\mathbf{x} + \Lambda \mu \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \mathbf{u}|^2 d\mathbf{x} \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2. \quad (3.2)$$

PROOF. Since $C^\infty(\Omega) \cap H^2(\Omega)$ is dense in $H^1(\Omega)$, it suffices to show (3.2) for $\mathbf{u} \in C^\infty(\Omega) \cap H^2(\Omega)$. Let $\hat{f}$ be the horizontal periodic Fourier transform of f , i.e.,

$$\hat{f}(\xi, x_3) = \int_{(2\pi L\mathbb{T})^2} f(\mathbf{x}', x_3) e^{-i\mathbf{x}' \cdot \xi} d\mathbf{x}' \quad \text{for } \xi \in (L^{-1}\mathbf{Z})^2,$$

and

$$\hat{u}_1(\xi, x_3) = -i\varphi(\xi, x_3), \quad \hat{u}_2(\xi, x_3) = -i\theta(\xi, x_3), \quad \hat{u}_3(\xi, x_3) = \psi(\xi, x_3).$$

Then $\xi_1 \varphi + \xi_2 \theta + \psi' = 0$ because of $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} = 0$. Moreover,

$$\widehat{\nabla \mathbf{u}} = (\widehat{\partial_i u_j}) = \begin{pmatrix} \xi_1 \varphi & \xi_1 \theta & i\xi_1 \psi \\ \xi_2 \varphi & \xi_2 \theta & i\xi_2 \psi \\ -i\varphi' & -i\theta' & \psi' \end{pmatrix}.$$

By the Fubini and Parseval theorems, we have (see [10, Section 3.3])

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} g \bar{\rho}' |u_3|^2 d\mathbf{x} &= \frac{1}{4\pi^2 L^2} \sum_{\xi \in (L^{-1}\mathbb{Z})^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(\bar{\rho}' 1_{\{\bar{\rho}' \geq 0\}} + \bar{\rho}' 1_{\{\bar{\rho}' < 0\}}) |\hat{u}_3|^2 dx_3 \\ &= \frac{1}{4\pi^2 L^2} \sum_{\xi \in (L^{-1}\mathbb{Z})^2} \int_{\Omega} g(\bar{\rho}' 1_{\{\bar{\rho}' \geq 0\}} + \bar{\rho}' 1_{\{\bar{\rho}' < 0\}}) |\psi|^2 dx_3 \\ &= \frac{1}{4\pi^2 L^2} \sum_{\xi \in (L^{-1}\mathbb{Z})^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} g \bar{\rho}' |\psi|^2 dx_3, \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

where $1_{\{\bar{\rho}' \geq 0\}}$ and $1_{\{\bar{\rho}' < 0\}}$ denote the characteristic functions. Obviously,

$$\lim_{|\xi| \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}} g \bar{\rho}' |\psi|^2 dx_3 = \int_{\mathbb{R}} g \bar{\rho}' |\psi(0, x_3)|^2 dx_3. \quad (3.4)$$

In addition, we can control the following terms involved with ψ .

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{4\pi^2 L^2} \left[\liminf_{|\xi| \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\xi_1^2}{|\xi|^2} (|\xi|^2 |\psi|^2 + |\psi'|^2) dx_3 + \sum_{\xi \in (L^{-1}\mathbb{Z})^2 \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\xi_1^2}{|\xi|^2} (|\xi|^2 |\psi|^2 + |\psi'|^2) dx_3 \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{4\pi^2 L^2} \sum_{\xi \in (L^{-1}\mathbb{Z})^2 \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\xi_1^2}{|\xi|^2} (|\xi|^2 |\psi|^2 + |\xi_1 \varphi + \xi_2 \theta|^2) dx_3 \\
&\leq \frac{2}{4\pi^2 L^2} \sum_{\xi \in (L^{-1}\mathbb{Z})^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\xi_1|^2 (|\varphi|^2 + |\theta|^2 + |\psi|^2) dx_3
\end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{4\pi^2 L^2} \left[\liminf_{|\xi| \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{(|\xi|^2 |\psi'|^2 + |\psi''|^2)}{|\xi|^2} dx_3 + \sum_{\xi \in (L^{-1}\mathbb{Z})^2 \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{(|\xi|^2 |\psi'|^2 + |\psi''|^2)}{|\xi|^2} dx_3 \right] \\
&\leq \frac{2}{4\pi^2 L^2} \sum_{\xi \in (L^{-1}\mathbb{Z})^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (|\varphi'|^2 + |\theta'|^2 + |\psi'|^2) dx_3 = 2 \int_{\Omega} |\partial_3 \mathbf{u}|^2 d\mathbf{x},
\end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{4\pi^2 L^2} \left[\limsup_{|\xi| \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\bar{\rho}(|\xi|^2 |\psi|^2 + |\psi'|^2)}{|\xi|^2} dx_3 + \sum_{\xi \in (L^{-1}\mathbb{Z})^2 \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\bar{\rho}(|\xi|^2 |\psi|^2 + |\psi'|^2)}{|\xi|^2} dx_3 \right] \\
&\leq \frac{2}{4\pi^2 L^2} \sum_{\xi \in (L^{-1}\mathbb{Z})^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \bar{\rho}(|\psi|^2 + |\varphi|^2 + |\theta|^2) dx_3 = 2 \int_{\Omega} \bar{\rho} |\mathbf{u}|^2 d\mathbf{x},
\end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{4\pi^2 L^2} \left[\limsup_{|\xi| \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{(4|\xi|^2 |\psi'|^2 + ||\xi|^2 \psi + \psi''|^2)}{|\xi|^2} dx_3 \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \sum_{\xi \in (L^{-1}\mathbb{Z})^2 \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{(4|\xi|^2 |\psi'|^2 + ||\xi|^2 \psi + \psi''|^2)}{|\xi|^2} dx_3 \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{4\pi^2 L^2} \left[\limsup_{|\xi| \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{2|\xi|^2 |\psi'|^2 + |\xi|^4 |\psi|^2 + |\psi''|^2}{|\xi|^2} dx_3 \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \sum_{\xi \in (L^{-1}\mathbb{Z})^2 \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{2|\xi|^2 |\psi'|^2 + |\xi|^4 |\psi|^2 + |\psi''|^2}{|\xi|^2} dx_3 \right] \\
&\leq \frac{2}{4\pi^2 L^2} \sum_{\xi \in (L^{-1}\mathbb{Z})^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} [|\xi|^2 (|\varphi|^2 + |\theta|^2 + |\psi|^2) + |\varphi'|^2 + |\theta'|^2 + |\psi'|^2] dx_3 \\
&= \frac{2}{4\pi^2 L^2} \sum_{\xi \in (L^{-1}\mathbb{Z})^2} \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq 3} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\widehat{\partial_i u_j}|^2 dx_3 = 2 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \mathbf{u}|^2 d\mathbf{x}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

Now, let

$$Z(\psi, \xi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} g \bar{\rho}' |\psi|^2 dx_3 - M^2 \begin{cases} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \xi_1^2 \left(|\psi|^2 + \frac{|\psi'|^2}{|\xi|^2} \right) dx_3, & \text{for } \bar{\mathbf{M}} = M e_1; \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(|\psi|^2 + \frac{|\psi''|^2}{|\xi|^2} \right) dx_3, & \text{for } \bar{\mathbf{M}} = M e_3. \end{cases} \tag{3.9}$$

By splitting $Z(\psi, \xi) = Z(\Re(\psi), \xi) + Z(\Im(\psi), \xi)$, we may reduce the boundedness of $Z(\psi, \xi)$ to the boundedness of $Z(\Re(\psi), \xi)$, since the imaginary part can be dealt with in the same manner. Hence, without loss of generality, assume that ψ is real-valued.

For $\xi \in \mathbb{A}^g \cap (L^{-1}\mathbb{Z})^2 \neq \emptyset$, we make use of (2.9) and (2.13) with $s = \lambda(\xi)$ to deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} Z(\psi, \xi) &\leq \frac{\lambda^2(\xi)}{|\xi|^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \bar{\rho}(|\xi|^2|\psi|^2 + |\psi'|^2) dx_3 + \frac{\mu\lambda(\xi)}{|\xi|^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (4|\xi|^2|\psi'|^2 + ||\xi|^2\psi + \psi''|^2) dx_3 \\ &\leq \frac{\Lambda}{|\xi|^2} \left[\Lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}} \bar{\rho}(|\xi|^2|\psi|^2 + |\psi'|^2) dx_3 + \mu \int_{\mathbb{R}} (4|\xi|^2|\psi'|^2 + ||\xi|^2\psi + \psi''|^2) dx_3 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

On the other hand, by Proposition 2.3, we infer that for any $\xi \notin \mathbb{A}^g \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$,

$$Z(\psi, \xi) \leq 0 \leq \frac{\Lambda}{|\xi|^2} \left[\Lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}} \bar{\rho}(|\xi|^2|\psi|^2 + |\psi'|^2) dx_3 + \mu \int_{\mathbb{R}} (4|\xi|^2|\psi'|^2 + ||\xi|^2\psi + \psi''|^2) dx_3 \right]. \quad (3.11)$$

Consequently, putting (3.3)–(3.11) together, we can conclude that (3.2) holds. In fact, taking $i = 1$ for example, we can estimate that

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \int_{\Omega} (g\bar{\rho}'|u_3|^2 - M^2|\partial_1 \mathbf{u}|^2) d\mathbf{x} &\leq \frac{1}{4\pi^2 L^2} \sum_{\xi \in (L^{-1}\mathbb{Z})^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} g\bar{\rho}'|\psi|^2 dx_3 \\ &\quad - \frac{M^2}{4\pi^2 L^2} \left[\liminf_{|\xi| \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\xi_1^2}{|\xi|^2} (|\xi|^2|\psi|^2 + |\psi'|^2) dx_3 + \sum_{\xi \in (L^{-1}\mathbb{Z})^2 \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\xi_1^2}{|\xi|^2} (|\xi|^2|\psi|^2 + |\psi'|^2) dx_3 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{4\pi^2 L^2} \left\{ \limsup_{|\xi| \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left[g\bar{\rho}'|\psi|^2 - \frac{\xi_1^2}{|\xi|^2} (|\xi|^2|\psi|^2 + |\psi'|^2) \right] dx_3 + \sum_{\xi \in (L^{-1}\mathbb{Z})^2 \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}} Z(\psi, \xi) \right\} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4\pi^2 L^2} \left\{ \limsup_{|\xi| \rightarrow 0} \frac{\Lambda}{|\xi|^2} \left[\Lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}} \bar{\rho}(|\xi|^2|\psi|^2 + |\psi'|^2) dx_3 + \mu \int_{\mathbb{R}} (4|\xi|^2|\psi'|^2 + ||\xi|^2\psi + \psi''|^2) dx_3 \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{\xi \in (L^{-1}\mathbb{Z})^2 \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}} \frac{\Lambda}{|\xi|^2} \left[\Lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}} \bar{\rho}(|\xi|^2|\psi|^2 + |\psi'|^2) dx_3 + \mu \int_{\mathbb{R}} (4|\xi|^2|\psi'|^2 + ||\xi|^2\psi + \psi''|^2) dx_3 \right] \right\} \\ &\leq 2\Lambda^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \rho|\mathbf{u}|^2 d\mathbf{x} + 2\Lambda\mu \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \mathbf{u}|^2 d\mathbf{x}, \end{aligned}$$

which gives (3.2) for $i = 1$. □

Now we are in a position to prove our main result of this section.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $(\varrho, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{N}, q)$ solve (1.7) with $\bar{\mathbf{M}} = \bar{\mathbf{M}}_i$ ($i = 1, 2$). Then we have the following estimates for any $t \geq 0$.*

$$\|\varrho(t)\|_X^2 \leq Ce^{2\Lambda t} (\|\varrho_0\|_X^2 + \|\mathbf{u}_0\|_{H^2}^2 + \|\nabla \mathbf{N}_0\|_{L^2}), \quad X = L^2 \text{ or } H^1, \quad (3.12)$$

$$\|\mathbf{u}(t)\|_{H^1}^2 + \|\mathbf{u}_t(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^t \|\nabla \mathbf{u}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \leq Ce^{2\Lambda t} (\|\varrho_0\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\mathbf{u}_0\|_{H^2}^2 + \|\nabla \mathbf{N}_0\|_{L^2}^2), \quad (3.13)$$

$$\|\mathbf{N}(t)\|_{L^2} \leq Ce^{\Lambda t} (\|\varrho_0\|_{L^2} + \|\mathbf{u}_0\|_{H^2} + \|\mathbf{N}_0\|_{H^1}), \quad (3.14)$$

where the constant C depends on $\bar{\rho}$, μ , Λ and $\bar{\mathbf{M}}_i$.

PROOF. Integrating (3.1) in time from 0 to t , we get by Lemma 3.2 that

$$\|\sqrt{\bar{\rho}}\mathbf{u}_t(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + 2\mu \int_0^t \|\nabla \partial_s \mathbf{u}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \leq I_0 + \Lambda^2 \|\sqrt{\bar{\rho}}\mathbf{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \Lambda\mu \|\nabla \mathbf{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \quad (3.15)$$

with

$$I_0 = \|\sqrt{\bar{\rho}}\mathbf{u}_t|_{t=0}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|M\partial_i \mathbf{u}_0\|_{L^2}^2 - g\|u_3(0)\|_{L^2}^2,$$

where the first term on the right-hand side of (3.15) can be bounded in terms of the initial data $(\varrho_0, \mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{N}_0)$. In fact, from (1.7)₂ and (1.2) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \bar{\rho} |\mathbf{u}_{\tau}|^2(\tau) d\mathbf{x} &= \int_{\Omega} [(\nabla \times \mathbf{N}) \times \bar{\mathbf{M}} + \mu \Delta \mathbf{u} - g \varrho \mathbf{e}_3] \cdot \mathbf{u}_{\tau}(\tau) d\mathbf{x} \\ &\leq C(\|\varrho(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Delta \mathbf{u}(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \mathbf{N}(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2) + \frac{\inf \bar{\rho}}{2} \|\mathbf{u}_{\tau}(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\|\mathbf{u}_{\tau}(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(\|\varrho(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Delta \mathbf{u}(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \mathbf{N}(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2) \quad \text{for any } \tau > 0.$$

Let $\tau \rightarrow 0$, we see that

$$\|\mathbf{u}_t|_{t=0}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(\|\varrho_0\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Delta \mathbf{u}_0\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \mathbf{N}_0\|_{L^2}^2).$$

Integrating in time and using Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda \|\nabla \mathbf{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 &= \Lambda \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_0\|_{L^2}^2 + 2\Lambda \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} \nabla \partial_s \mathbf{u}(s) : \nabla \mathbf{u}(s) d\mathbf{x} ds \\ &\leq \Lambda \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_0\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^t \|\nabla \partial_s \mathbf{u}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds + \Lambda^2 \int_0^t \|\nabla \mathbf{u}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds. \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

On the other hand,

$$\Lambda \partial_t \|\sqrt{\bar{\rho}}\mathbf{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 = 2\Lambda \int_{\Omega} \bar{\rho} \mathbf{u} \cdot \partial_t \mathbf{u}(t) d\mathbf{x} \leq \|\sqrt{\bar{\rho}}\partial_t \mathbf{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \Lambda^2 \|\sqrt{\bar{\rho}}\mathbf{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2. \quad (3.17)$$

Hence, putting (3.15)–(3.17) together, we obtain the differential inequality

$$\partial_t \|\sqrt{\bar{\rho}}\mathbf{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \mu \|\nabla \mathbf{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq I_1 + 2\Lambda \left(\|\sqrt{\bar{\rho}}\mathbf{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \mu \int_0^t \|\nabla \mathbf{u}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \right)$$

with $I_1 = 2\mu \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_0\|_{L^2}^2 + I_0/\Lambda$. An application of Gronwall's inequality then shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\sqrt{\bar{\rho}}\mathbf{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \mu \int_0^t \|\nabla \mathbf{u}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds &\leq e^{2\Lambda t} \|\sqrt{\bar{\rho}}\mathbf{u}_0\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{I_1}{2\Lambda} (e^{2\Lambda t} - 1) \\ &\leq C e^{2\Lambda t} (\|\varrho_0\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\mathbf{u}_0\|_{H^2}^2 + \|\nabla \mathbf{N}_0\|_{L^2}^2) \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

for any $t \geq 0$. Thus, making use of (3.15), (3.16) and (3.18), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\Lambda} \|\sqrt{\bar{\rho}}\mathbf{u}_t(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \mu \|\nabla \mathbf{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq I_1 + \Lambda \|\sqrt{\bar{\rho}}\mathbf{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + 2\Lambda\mu \int_0^t \|\nabla \mathbf{u}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \\ &\leq C e^{2\Lambda t} (\|\varrho_0\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\mathbf{u}_0\|_{H^2}^2 + \|\nabla \mathbf{N}_0\|_{L^2}^2), \end{aligned}$$

which yields (3.13).

To prove (3.12), we use (3.13) and (1.7)₁ to arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\varrho(t)\|_X &\leq \|\varrho_0\|_X + \int_0^t \|\varrho_s(s)\|_X ds \\
&\leq \|\varrho_0\|_X + \|\bar{\rho}'\|_{L^\infty} \int_0^t \|u_3(s)\|_X ds \\
&\leq Ce^{\Lambda t} (\|\varrho_0\|_X + \|\mathbf{u}_0\|_{H^2} + \|\nabla \mathbf{N}_0\|_{L^2}),
\end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

where $X = L^2$ or H^1 . Similar to the derivation of (3.19), one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{N}(t)\|_{L^2} &\leq \|\mathbf{N}_0\|_{L^2} + \int_0^t \|\mathbf{N}_s(s)\|_{L^2} ds \\
&\leq \|\mathbf{N}_0\|_{L^2} + \|\bar{\mathbf{M}}\|_{L^\infty} \int_0^t \|\nabla \mathbf{u}(s)\|_{L^2} ds \\
&\leq Ce^{\Lambda t} (\|\varrho_0\|_{L^2} + \|\mathbf{u}_0\|_{H^2} + \|\mathbf{N}_0\|_{H^1}).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence (3.13) and (3.14) hold. This completes the proof of the lemma. $\square$

4. Nonlinear energy estimates of the perturbed problem

In this section, we derive some nonlinear energy estimates for the perturbed Cauchy problem (1.4)–(1.6), and the integrand form of Gronwall's inequality of the high-order energy estimates. To this end, let $(\varrho, \mathbf{u}, q)$ be a classical solution of the perturbed problem (1.4)–(1.6) with $\rho := \varrho + \bar{\rho} > 0$ in $(0, T) \times \Omega$ for some $T > 0$. Moreover, we assume that the classical solution $(\varrho, \mathbf{u}, q)$ possesses proper regularity, which makes the procedure of formal deduction sense.

In what follows, we denote by $C(\delta_0)$ a generic positive constant depending on δ_0 . The notation $a \lesssim b$ means that $a \leq Cb$ for a universal constant $C > 0$, which may depend on some physical parameters in (1.4). $\mathcal{E} := \mathcal{E}(t) := \mathcal{E}(\varrho, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{N}) := (\|(\varrho, \mathbf{N})\|_{H^3}^2 + \|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^4}^2)^{1/2}$ and $\mathcal{E}_0 = \mathcal{E}(\varrho_0, \mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{N}_0)$. $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3)$ denotes a multi-index of order $|\alpha| = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3$.

4.1. Estimate of the perturbation density

We first note that by the classical Sobolev embedding results (see [1, Chapter 5]), we have

$$\|u\|_{L^4} \lesssim \|u\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{4}} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^{\frac{3}{4}} \lesssim \|u\|_{H^1}, \tag{4.1}$$

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \|u\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{4}} \|u\|_{H^2}^{\frac{3}{4}} \lesssim \|u\|_{H^2}, \tag{4.2}$$

$$\|u\|_{H^j} \lesssim \|u\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{j+1}} \|u\|_{H^{j+1}}^{\frac{j}{j+1}}. \tag{4.3}$$

With the help of the above estimates, we can bound the perturbation density ϱ . In fact, applying ∂^α to (1.4)₁, multiplying the resulting identity by $\partial^\alpha \varrho$ in $L^2(\Omega)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \sum_{0 \leq |\alpha| \leq 3} \int_\Omega (\partial^\alpha \varrho)^2 dx &= - \sum_{0 \leq |\alpha| \leq 3} \int_\Omega \partial^\alpha (\bar{\rho}' u_3) \partial^\alpha \varrho dx + \sum_{0 \leq |\alpha| \leq 3} \int_\Omega \partial^\alpha (\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \varrho) \partial^\alpha \varrho dx \\
&:= I_1 + I_2,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

where I_1 can be bounded as follows, using (4.3), Hölder's and Young's inequalities.

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &\lesssim \sum_{0 \leq |\alpha| \leq 3} \|\partial^\alpha(\bar{\rho}' u_3)\|_{L^2} \|\partial^\alpha \varrho\|_{L^2} \\
&\lesssim \|\varrho\|_{L^2} \|u_3\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \varrho\|_{L^2} (\|u_3\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla u_3\|_{L^2}) \\
&\quad + \|\nabla^2 \varrho\|_{L^2} (\|u_3\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla u_3\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla^2 u_3\|_{L^2}) \\
&\quad + \|\nabla^3 \varrho\|_{L^2} (\|u_3\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla u_3\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla^2 u_3\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla^3 u_3\|_{L^2}) \\
&\lesssim \|\varrho\|_{H^3} \|u_3\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \varrho\|_{H^2} \|u_3\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|u_3\|_{H^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \|\nabla^2 \varrho\|_{H^1} \|u_3\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{3}} \|u_3\|_{H^3}^{\frac{2}{3}} \\
&\quad + \|\nabla^3 \varrho\|_{L^2} \|u_3\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{4}} \|u_3\|_{H^3}^{\frac{3}{4}} \lesssim C(\delta_0) \|u_3\|_{L^2}^2 + \delta_0 \mathcal{E}^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

On the other hand, keeping in mind that $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} = 0$, we use (4.1), (4.2) and Hölder's inequality to control I_2 as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2 &\lesssim \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^4} \|\nabla \varrho\|_{L^4} \|\nabla \varrho\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla^2 \mathbf{u}\|_{L^4} \|\nabla \varrho\|_{L^4} \|\nabla^2 \varrho\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla^2 \varrho\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\quad + \|\nabla^3 \mathbf{u}\|_{L^4} \|\nabla \varrho\|_{L^4} \|\nabla^3 \varrho\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla^2 \mathbf{u}\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla^2 \varrho\|_{L^2} \|\nabla^3 \varrho\|_{L^2} \\
&\quad + \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla^3 \varrho\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{0 \leq |\alpha| \leq 3} \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{u} \cdot \partial^\alpha \nabla \varrho \partial^\alpha \varrho \, d\mathbf{x} \\
&\lesssim \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{H^1} \|\nabla \varrho\|_{H^1} \|\nabla \varrho\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{H^2} \|\nabla \varrho\|_{H^1} \|\nabla^2 \varrho\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{H^2} \|\nabla^2 \varrho\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\quad + \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{H^3} \|\nabla \varrho\|_{H^2}^2 - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{0 \leq |\alpha| \leq 3} \int_{\Omega} |\partial^\alpha \varrho|^2 \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} \, d\mathbf{x} \lesssim \mathcal{E}^3.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

Hence, one gets from (4.4)–(4.6) that

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\varrho(t)\|_{H^2}^2 \lesssim C(\delta_0) \|u_3(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \delta_0 \mathcal{E}^2(t) + \mathcal{E}^3(t). \tag{4.7}$$

In addition, we can deduce from (1.4)₁ that

$$\|\varrho_t\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|u_3\|_{L^2} + \mathcal{E}^2, \tag{4.8}$$

$$\|\nabla \varrho_t\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|u_3\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla u_3\|_{L^2} + \mathcal{E}^2 \lesssim C(\delta_0) \|u_3\|_{L^2} + \delta_0 \mathcal{E} + \mathcal{E}^2, \tag{4.9}$$

$$\|\varrho_{tt}\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\mathbf{u}_t\|_{L^2} (1 + \mathcal{E}) + \mathcal{E}^2 + \mathcal{E}^3. \tag{4.10}$$

4.2. Estimate of the perturbation magnetic field

We continue to bound the perturbation magnetic field $\mathbf{N}$. Applying ∂^α to (1.4)₃, multiplying the resulting identity by $\partial^\alpha \mathbf{N}$ in $L^2(\Omega)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \sum_{0 \leq |\alpha| \leq 3} \int_{\Omega} |\partial^\alpha \mathbf{N}|^2 \, d\mathbf{x} \\
&= \sum_{0 \leq |\alpha| \leq 2} \int_{\Omega} \partial^\alpha (\bar{\mathbf{M}} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}) \cdot \partial^\alpha \mathbf{N} \, d\mathbf{x} + \sum_{0 \leq |\alpha| \leq 3} \int_{\Omega} \partial^\alpha (\nabla \times (\mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{N})) \cdot \partial^\alpha \mathbf{N} \, d\mathbf{x} \\
&\quad + \sum_{|\alpha|=3} \int_{\Omega} \partial^\alpha (\bar{\mathbf{M}} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}) \cdot \partial^\alpha \mathbf{N} \, d\mathbf{x} := J_1 + J_2 + J_3,
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact $\nabla \times (\mathbf{u} \times \bar{\mathbf{M}}) = \bar{\mathbf{M}} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}$.

Noting that $\nabla \times (\mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{N}) = \mathbf{N} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{N}$, similar to the derivation of (4.5) and (4.6), we can control J_1 and J_2 as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
J_1 &\lesssim \sum_{0 \leq |\alpha| \leq 2} \|\partial^\alpha \nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2} \|\partial^\alpha \mathbf{N}\|_{L^2} \\
&\lesssim \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2} \|\mathbf{N}\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla^2 \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2} \|\nabla \mathbf{N}\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla^3 \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2} \|\nabla^2 \mathbf{N}\|_{L^2} \\
&\lesssim \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\mathbf{N}\|_{L^2} + \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{3}} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^3}^{\frac{2}{3}} \|\nabla \mathbf{N}\|_{L^2} + \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{4}} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^4}^{\frac{3}{4}} \|\nabla^2 \mathbf{N}\|_{L^2} \\
&\lesssim C(\delta_0) \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^2}^2 + \delta_0 \mathcal{E}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
J_2 &\lesssim \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^4} \|\mathbf{N}\|_{L^4} \|\mathbf{N}\|_{L^2} + (\|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^4} \|\nabla \mathbf{N}\|_{L^4} + \|\nabla^2 \mathbf{u}\|_{L^4} \|\mathbf{N}\|_{L^4}) \|\nabla \mathbf{N}\|_{L^2} \\
&\quad + (\|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla^2 \mathbf{N}\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla^2 \mathbf{u}\|_{L^4} \|\nabla \mathbf{N}\|_{L^4} + \|\nabla^3 \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2} \|\mathbf{N}\|_{L^\infty}) \|\nabla^2 \mathbf{N}\|_{L^2} \\
&\quad + (\|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla^3 \mathbf{N}\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla^2 \mathbf{u}\|_{L^4} \|\nabla^2 \mathbf{N}\|_{L^4} \\
&\quad \quad + \|\nabla^3 \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2} \|\nabla \mathbf{N}\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla^4 \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2} \|\mathbf{N}\|_{L^\infty}) \|\nabla^3 \mathbf{N}\|_{L^2} \\
&\quad + \sum_{0 \leq |\alpha| \leq 3} \int_{\Omega} (\mathbf{u} \cdot \partial^\alpha \nabla \mathbf{N}) \cdot \partial^\alpha \mathbf{N} d\mathbf{x} \\
&\lesssim \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{H^1} \|\mathbf{N}\|_{H^1} \|\mathbf{N}\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{H^2} \|\mathbf{N}\|_{H^2} \|\nabla \mathbf{N}\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{H^2} \|\mathbf{N}\|_{H^2} \|\nabla^2 \mathbf{N}\|_{L^2} \\
&\quad + \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{H^3} \|\mathbf{N}\|_{H^3} \|\nabla^3 \mathbf{N}\|_{L^2} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{0 \leq |\alpha| \leq 3} \int_{\Omega} |\partial^\alpha \mathbf{N}|^2 \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} d\mathbf{x} \lesssim \mathcal{E}^3.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, one gets

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\mathbf{N}(t)\|_{H^3}^2 \lesssim C(\delta_0) \|\mathbf{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \delta_0 \mathcal{E}^2(t) + \mathcal{E}^3(t) + J_3. \quad (4.11)$$

In addition, we infer from (1.4)₄ that

$$\|\mathbf{N}_t\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2} + \mathcal{E}^2 \lesssim C(\delta_0) \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^2} + \delta_0 \mathcal{E} + \mathcal{E}^2, \quad (4.12)$$

$$\|\nabla \mathbf{N}_t\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\nabla^2 \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2} + \mathcal{E}^2 \lesssim C(\delta_0) \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^2} + \delta_0 \mathcal{E} + \mathcal{E}^2, \quad (4.13)$$

$$\|\mathbf{N}_{tt}\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\mathbf{u}_t\|_{H^1} (1 + \mathcal{E}) + \mathcal{E}^2 + \mathcal{E}^3. \quad (4.14)$$

4.3. Estimate of the perturbation velocity

First we restrict the density $\rho = \varrho + \bar{\rho}$ to possess a positive lower bound. By virtue of (4.2), there is a constant $\delta'_0 \in (0, 1)$, such that

$$\|\varrho_0\|_{L^\infty} \leq \frac{\inf_{x_3 \in \mathbb{R}} \{\bar{\rho}(x_3)\}}{2} \quad \text{for any } \|\varrho_0\|_{H^2} \leq \delta'_0. \quad (4.15)$$

Consequently, in view of (1.4)₁ and $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} = 0$, we find that for any $(t, \mathbf{x}) \in [0, T) \times \Omega$,

$$\frac{\inf_{x_3 \in \mathbb{R}} \{\bar{\rho}(x_3)\}}{2} \leq \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \Omega} \{\rho_0(t, \mathbf{x})\} \leq \rho(t, \mathbf{x}) \leq \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \Omega} \{\rho_0(t, \mathbf{x})\} \leq \frac{3 \sup_{x_3 \in \mathbb{R}} \{\bar{\rho}(x_3)\}}{2},$$

where $\rho_0 = \varrho_0 + \bar{\rho}$. From now on, we always assume that $\mathcal{E} \leq \delta_0 \leq \delta'_0 < 1$. We remark that the upper and lower boundedness of ρ will be repeatedly used below.

We now estimate the time-derivative of the perturbation velocity. Multiplying (1.4)₂ by $\mathbf{u}$ in $L^2(\Omega)$, utilizing (1.4)₁ and integrating by parts, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} (\varrho + \bar{\rho}) |\mathbf{u}|^2 d\mathbf{x} + \mu \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \mathbf{u}|^2 d\mathbf{x} &= \int_{\Omega} [(\nabla \times \mathbf{N}) \times (\mathbf{N} + \bar{\mathbf{M}}) - g\varrho \mathbf{e}_3] \cdot \mathbf{u} d\mathbf{x} \\ &:= \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{Y}_0 \cdot \mathbf{u} d\mathbf{x}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{Y}_0 := (\nabla \times \mathbf{N}) \times (\mathbf{N} + \bar{\mathbf{M}}) - g\varrho \mathbf{e}_3$. Applying ∂_t to (1.4)₂, multiplying the resulting identity by $\mathbf{u}_t$ in $L^2(\Omega)$, we make use of (1.4)₁, and integrate by parts to deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} (\varrho + \bar{\rho}) |\mathbf{u}_t|^2 d\mathbf{x} + \mu \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \mathbf{u}_t|^2 d\mathbf{x} \\ = \int_{\Omega} \left[(\nabla \times \mathbf{N}_t) \times (\mathbf{N} + \bar{\mathbf{M}}) + (\nabla \times \mathbf{N}) \times \mathbf{N}_t - \varrho_t \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} \right. \\ \left. - (\varrho + \bar{\rho}) \mathbf{u}_t \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} - g\varrho_t \mathbf{e}_3 - \varrho_t \mathbf{u}_t \right] \cdot \mathbf{u}_t d\mathbf{x} := \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{Y}_1 \cdot \mathbf{u}_t d\mathbf{x}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying ∂_t^2 to (1.4)₂ again, multiplying the resulting identity by $\mathbf{u}_t^2$, employing (1.4)₁ and

$$(\nabla \times \mathbf{N}) \times (\mathbf{N} + \bar{\mathbf{M}}) = (\mathbf{N} + \bar{\mathbf{M}}) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{N} - \frac{1}{2} \nabla |(\mathbf{N} + \bar{\mathbf{M}})|^2,$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} (\varrho + \bar{\rho}) |\mathbf{u}_{tt}|^2 d\mathbf{x} + \mu \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \mathbf{u}_{tt}|^2 d\mathbf{x} \\ = \int_{\Omega} \left\{ -\mathbf{N}_{tt} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_{tt} \cdot \mathbf{N} - \mathbf{N}_t \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_{tt} \cdot \mathbf{N}_t - (\mathbf{N} + \bar{\mathbf{M}}) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_{tt} \cdot \mathbf{N}_{tt} - \left[g\varrho_{tt} \mathbf{e}_3 - \varrho_{tt} \mathbf{u}_t \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. - \varrho_t \mathbf{u}_{tt} - \varrho_{tt} \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} - \varrho_t \mathbf{u}_t \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} - \varrho_t \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_t - (\varrho + \bar{\rho}) \mathbf{u}_t \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_t - (\varrho + \bar{\rho}) \mathbf{u}_{tt} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} \right] \cdot \mathbf{u}_{tt} \right\} d\mathbf{x} \\ := - \sum_{i=0}^2 \int_{\Omega} \partial_t^i (\mathbf{N} + \bar{\mathbf{M}}) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_{tt} \cdot \partial_t^{2-i} \mathbf{N} d\mathbf{x} + \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{Y}_2 \cdot \mathbf{u}_{tt} d\mathbf{x}. \end{aligned}$$

Adding the above three equalities, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \sum_{i=0}^2 \int_{\Omega} (\varrho + \bar{\rho}) |\partial_t^i \mathbf{u}|^2 d\mathbf{x} + \mu \sum_{i=0}^2 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \partial_t^i \mathbf{u}|^2 d\mathbf{x} \\ = \sum_{i=0}^2 \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{Y}_i \cdot \partial_t^i \mathbf{u} d\mathbf{x} - \sum_{i=0}^2 \int_{\Omega} \partial_t^i (\mathbf{N} + \bar{\mathbf{M}}) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_{tt} \cdot \partial_t^{2-i} \mathbf{N} d\mathbf{x}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

Obviously,

$$\|\mathbf{Y}_0\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\varrho\|_{L^2} + \|\mathbf{N}\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\mathbf{N}\|_{H^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\mathbf{N}\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim C(\delta_0) \|(\varrho, \mathbf{N})\|_{L^2} + \delta_0 \mathcal{E}^2. \tag{4.17}$$

Recalling that $\mathcal{E} \leq \delta < 1$, we use (4.1), (4.2), (4.8), (4.9), (4.12) and (4.13) to arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{Y}_1\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \|\varrho_t\|_{L^2} + \|\varrho_t\|_{L^2} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^\infty} + \|\varrho + \bar{\rho}\|_{L^\infty} \|\mathbf{u}_t\|_{L^2} \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\quad + (1 + \|\mathbf{N}\|_{L^\infty}) \|\nabla \mathbf{N}_t\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \mathbf{N}\|_{L^4} \|\mathbf{N}_t\|_{L^4} + \|\varrho_t\|_{L^4} \|\mathbf{u}_t\|_{L^4} \\ &\lesssim \|\varrho_t\|_{L^2} + \|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^3}^2 \|\varrho_t\|_{L^2} + \|\varrho_t\|_{H^1} \|\mathbf{u}_t\|_{H^1} + \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_{H^2} \|\mathbf{u}_t\|_{L^2} \\ &\quad + \|\nabla \mathbf{N}_t\|_{L^2} + \|\mathbf{N}\|_{H^2} \|\mathbf{N}_t\|_{H^1} \\ &\lesssim C(\delta_0) \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^2} + \delta_0 \mathcal{E} + \mathcal{E} \|\mathbf{u}_t\|_{H^1}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.18}$$

To bound $\mathbf{Y}_2$, we argue in a way similar to that used for (4.18) with the additional estimates (4.10) and (4.3) to infer that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathbf{Y}_2\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \|\varrho_{tt}\|_{L^2}(1 + \mathcal{E}^2 + \|\mathbf{u}_t\|_{H^2}) + \|\varrho_t\|_{H^1}(\|\mathbf{u}_{tt}\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{4}}\|\mathbf{u}_{tt}\|_{H^1}^{\frac{3}{4}} + \mathcal{E}\|\mathbf{u}_t\|_{H^2}) \\ &\quad + \|\mathbf{u}_t\|_{H^1}\|\nabla\mathbf{u}_t\|_{H^1} + \mathcal{E}\|\mathbf{u}_{tt}\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim (\|\mathbf{u}_t\|_{H^1}(1 + \mathcal{E}) + \mathcal{E}^2)(1 + \mathcal{E}^2 + \|\mathbf{u}_t\|_{H^2}) + \mathcal{E}(\|\mathbf{u}_{tt}\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{4}}\|\mathbf{u}_{tt}\|_{H^1}^{\frac{3}{4}} + \mathcal{E}\|\mathbf{u}_t\|_{H^2}).\end{aligned}\tag{4.19}$$

Finally, using (4.12)–(4.14), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\sum_{i=0}^2\int_{\Omega}\partial_t^i(\mathbf{N} + \bar{\mathbf{M}}) \cdot \nabla\mathbf{u}_{tt} \cdot \partial_t^{2-i}\mathbf{N}d\mathbf{x}\right| \\ &\lesssim [(1 + \mathcal{E})\|\mathbf{N}_{tt}\|_{L^2} + \|\mathbf{N}_t\|_{H^1}^2]\|\nabla\mathbf{u}_{tt}\|_{L^2} \lesssim [(1 + \mathcal{E})\|\mathbf{u}_t\|_{H^1} + \mathcal{E}^2]\|\mathbf{u}_{tt}\|_{H^1}.\end{aligned}\tag{4.20}$$

Putting (4.16)–(4.20) together and using Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality, we conclude

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\sum_{i=0}^2(\varrho + \bar{\rho})\|\partial_t^i\mathbf{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{i=0}^2\|\nabla\partial_t^i\mathbf{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim C(\delta_0)\|(\varrho, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{N})(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \delta_0\mathcal{E}^2(t) \\ &\quad + (C(\delta_0)\|\mathbf{u}(t)\|_{L^2} + \delta_0\mathcal{E}(t) + \mathcal{E}^2(t) + \mathcal{E}(t)\|\mathbf{u}_t(t)\|_{H^1})\|\mathbf{u}_t(t)\|_{L^2} \\ &\quad + [\|\mathbf{u}_t(t)\|_{H^1}(1 + \mathcal{E}(t)) + \mathcal{E}^2(t)](1 + \mathcal{E}^2(t) + \|\mathbf{u}_t(t)\|_{H^2})\|\mathbf{u}_{tt}(t)\|_{L^2} \\ &\quad + \mathcal{E}(t)(\|\mathbf{u}_{tt}(t)\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{4}}\|\mathbf{u}_{tt}(t)\|_{H^1}^{\frac{3}{4}} + \mathcal{E}(t)\|\mathbf{u}_t(t)\|_{H^2})\|\mathbf{u}_{tt}(t)\|_{L^2} \\ &\quad + [(1 + \mathcal{E}(t))\|\mathbf{u}_t(t)\|_{H^1} + \mathcal{E}^2(t)]^2.\end{aligned}\tag{4.21}$$

We proceed to estimate higher derivatives of the perturbation velocity. Rewriting (1.4)₂ as

$$-\mu\Delta\mathbf{u} + (\varrho + \bar{\rho})\mathbf{u}_t + \nabla q = (\nabla \times \mathbf{N}) \times (\mathbf{N} + \bar{\mathbf{M}}) - g\varrho\mathbf{e}_3 - (\varrho + \bar{\rho})\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla\mathbf{u},\tag{4.22}$$

and multiplying (4.22) by $\mathbf{u}_t$ in $L^2(\Omega)$, we have

$$\frac{\mu}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int_{\Omega}|\nabla\mathbf{u}(t)|^2d\mathbf{x} + \int_{\Omega}(\varrho + \bar{\rho})|\mathbf{u}_t|^2d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\Omega}[\mathbf{Y}_0 - (\varrho + \bar{\rho})\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla\mathbf{u}] \cdot \mathbf{u}_td\mathbf{x}.$$

Differentiating (4.22) with respect to t and multiplying the resulting equations by $\mathbf{u}_{tt}$ in $L^2(\Omega)$, we obtain

$$\frac{\mu}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int_{\Omega}|\nabla\mathbf{u}_t(t)|^2d\mathbf{x} + \int_{\Omega}(\varrho + \bar{\rho})|\mathbf{u}_{tt}|^2d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\Omega}[\mathbf{Y}_1 - (\varrho + \bar{\rho})\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla\mathbf{u}_t] \cdot \mathbf{u}_{tt}d\mathbf{x}.$$

Adding the above two equalities, we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{\mu}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\sum_{i=0}^1\int_{\Omega}|\nabla\partial_t^i\mathbf{u}(t)|^2d\mathbf{x} + \sum_{i=0}^1\int_{\Omega}(\varrho + \bar{\rho})|\partial_t^{i+1}\mathbf{u}|^2d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \int_{\Omega}[\mathbf{Y}_0 - (\varrho + \bar{\rho})\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla\mathbf{u}] \cdot \mathbf{u}_td\mathbf{x} + \int_{\Omega}[\mathbf{Y}_1 - (\varrho + \bar{\rho})\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla\mathbf{u}_t] \cdot \mathbf{u}_{tt}d\mathbf{x}.\end{aligned}\tag{4.23}$$

Clearly,

$$\|(\varrho + \bar{\rho})\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla\mathbf{u}\|_{L^2} + \|(\varrho + \bar{\rho})\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla\mathbf{u}_t\|_{L^2} \lesssim \mathcal{E}^2 + \mathcal{E}\|\nabla\mathbf{u}_t\|_{L^2}.\tag{4.24}$$

Consequently, in view of (4.18), (4.19) and (4.24), using Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality, we get from (4.23) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} \sum_{i=0}^1 \|\nabla \partial_t^i \mathbf{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{i=0}^1 \|\partial_t^{i+1} \mathbf{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & \lesssim C(\delta_0) \|(\varrho, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{N})(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \delta_0 \mathcal{E}^2(t) + \mathcal{E}^2(t) \|\mathbf{u}_t(t)\|_{H^1}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.25)$$

Next, we continue to derive more estimates of higher-order derivatives of the perturbation velocity. Multiplying (1.4)₂ by $\mathbf{u}_t$, integrating and using (4.3), one gets

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{u}_t\|_{L^2}^2 & \lesssim \|\sqrt{\varrho + \bar{\rho}} \mathbf{u}_t\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \|\varrho\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Delta \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \mathbf{N}\|_{L^2}^2 + \mathcal{E}^4 \\ & \lesssim C(\delta_0) \|(\varrho, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{N})\|_{L^2}^2 + \delta_0 \mathcal{E}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (4.26)$$

while applying ∂_i to (1.4)₂, multiplying the resulting equations by $\partial_i \mathbf{u}_t$ in $L^2(\Omega)$, and using (4.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_i \mathbf{u}_t\|_{L^2}^2 & \lesssim \|\sqrt{\varrho + \bar{\rho}} \partial_i \mathbf{u}_t\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim C(\delta_0) \|(\varrho, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{N})\|_{L^2}^2 + \delta_0 \mathcal{E}^2 + (1 + \mathcal{E}^2) \|\mathbf{u}_t\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & \lesssim C(\delta_0) \|(\varrho, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{N})\|_{L^2}^2 + \delta_0 \mathcal{E}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.27)$$

If we take $\partial_i \partial_j$ to (1.4)₂ and multiply the resulting equations with $\partial_i \mathbf{u}_t$ in $L^2(\Omega)$, we see that

$$\|\partial_i \partial_j \mathbf{u}_t\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \|\sqrt{\varrho + \bar{\rho}} \partial_i \partial_j \mathbf{u}_t\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \mathcal{E}^2 + (1 + \mathcal{E}^2) \|\mathbf{u}_t\|_{H^1}^2 \lesssim \mathcal{E}^2.$$

In particular, summing up the above three estimates, we conclude

$$\|\mathbf{u}_t\|_{H^2}^2 \lesssim \mathcal{E}^2. \quad (4.28)$$

Finally, adding (4.21) to (4.25), and utilizing (4.26)–(4.28), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} \left(\sum_{i=0}^1 \|\nabla \partial_t^i \mathbf{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{i=0}^2 \|\sqrt{\varrho + \bar{\rho}} \partial_t^i \mathbf{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \right) \\ & + \sum_{i=0}^1 \|\partial_t^i (\nabla \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}_t, \nabla \mathbf{u}_t)(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim C(\delta_0) \|(\varrho, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{N})(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \delta_0 \mathcal{E}^2(t), \end{aligned} \quad (4.29)$$

provided δ_0 is sufficiently small.

4.4. Energy estimates

Now, we sum up the previous estimates (4.7), (4.11) and (4.29), and use Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality to find that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} \left[\|(\varrho, \mathbf{N})(t)\|_{H^3}^2 + \sum_{i=0}^1 \|\nabla \partial_t^i \mathbf{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{i=0}^2 \|\sqrt{\varrho + \bar{\rho}} \partial_t^i \mathbf{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \right] \\ & + \sum_{i=0}^1 \|\partial_t^i (\nabla \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}_t, \nabla \mathbf{u}_t)(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim C(\delta_0) \|(\varrho, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{N})(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + J_3 + \delta_0 \mathcal{E}^2(t), \end{aligned} \quad (4.30)$$

provided δ_0 is sufficiently small.

To deal with the term J_3 , we shall make use of the momentum equations (1.4)₂. Let $\alpha := (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3)$ be given and satisfy $|\alpha| = 3$. Without loss of generality, assume $\alpha_1 \neq 0$. By employing a partial integration, one sees

$$\int_{\Omega} \partial^\alpha (\bar{\mathbf{M}} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}) \cdot \partial^\alpha \mathbf{N} d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\Omega} \bar{\mathbf{M}} \cdot \nabla \partial^\gamma \mathbf{N} \cdot \partial^\beta \mathbf{u} d\mathbf{x}, \quad (4.31)$$

where $\gamma := (\alpha_1 - 1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3)$ and $\beta := (\alpha_1 + 1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3)$ satisfying $|\gamma| = 2$ and $|\beta| = 4$. Letting $\partial^\gamma := \partial_i \partial_j$, and applying ∂^γ to (1.4)₂, keeping in mind that

$$(\nabla \times \mathbf{N}) \times \bar{\mathbf{M}} = \bar{\mathbf{M}} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{N} - \nabla (\mathbf{N} \cdot \bar{\mathbf{M}}),$$

we find that

$$\begin{aligned} & (\varrho + \bar{\rho}) \partial^\gamma \mathbf{u}_t + \nabla \partial^\gamma q + g \partial^\gamma \varrho \mathbf{e}_3 - \mu \Delta \partial^\gamma \mathbf{u} \\ &= -\mathbf{u}_t \partial^\gamma (\varrho + \bar{\rho}) - \partial_i (\varrho + \bar{\rho}) \partial_j \mathbf{u}_t - \partial_j (\varrho + \bar{\rho}) \partial_i \mathbf{u}_t - \partial^\gamma [(\varrho + \bar{\rho}) \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}] \\ &+ \partial^\gamma [(\nabla \times \mathbf{N}) \times \mathbf{N}] - \nabla (\partial^\gamma \mathbf{N} \cdot \bar{\mathbf{M}}) + \bar{\mathbf{M}} \cdot \nabla \partial^\gamma \mathbf{N}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.32)$$

Multiplying (4.32) by $\partial^\beta \mathbf{u}$ with $|\beta| = 4$ in $L^2(\Omega)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} (\varrho + \bar{\rho}) |\partial^\alpha \mathbf{u}|^2 d\mathbf{x} + \mu \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \partial^\alpha \mathbf{u}|^2 d\mathbf{x} \\ &= - \int_{\Omega} \partial_1 (\varrho + \bar{\rho}) \partial^\gamma \mathbf{u}_t \cdot \partial^\alpha \mathbf{u} d\mathbf{x} + \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{u}_t \partial^\gamma (\varrho + \bar{\rho}) \cdot \partial^\beta \mathbf{u} d\mathbf{x} \\ &+ \int_{\Omega} \partial_i (\varrho + \bar{\rho}) \partial_j \mathbf{u}_t \cdot \partial^\beta \mathbf{u} d\mathbf{x} + \int_{\Omega} \partial_j (\varrho + \bar{\rho}) \partial_i \mathbf{u}_t \cdot \partial^\beta \mathbf{u} d\mathbf{x} \\ &+ \int_{\Omega} \partial^\gamma [(\varrho + \bar{\rho}) \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}] \cdot \partial^\beta \mathbf{u} d\mathbf{x} - \int_{\Omega} \partial^\gamma [(\nabla \times \mathbf{N}) \times \mathbf{N}] \cdot \partial^\beta \mathbf{u} d\mathbf{x} \\ &- g \int_{\Omega} \partial^\alpha \varrho \partial^\alpha u_3 d\mathbf{x} + \int_{\Omega} (\varrho + \bar{\rho}) \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \partial^\alpha \mathbf{u} \cdot \partial^\alpha \mathbf{u} d\mathbf{x} - \int_{\Omega} \bar{\mathbf{M}} \cdot \nabla \partial^\gamma \mathbf{N} \cdot \partial^\beta \mathbf{u} d\mathbf{x} = \sum_{n=1}^9 I_n \end{aligned}$$

Recalling that $\mathcal{E}(t) < \delta_0 \ll 1$, it is easy to verify that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{n=1}^9 I_n \right| &\lesssim \|\partial^\alpha \varrho\|_{L^2} \|\partial^\alpha u_3\|_{L^2} + (\|\partial^\alpha \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2} + \mathcal{E}^2) \|\mathbf{u}_t\|_{H^2} + \mathcal{E}^3 \\ &\lesssim C(\delta_0) \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^2}^2 + \delta_0 \mathcal{E}^{\frac{6}{7}} \|\mathbf{u}_t\|_{H^2}^{\frac{8}{7}} + \mathcal{E}^2 \|\mathbf{u}_t\|_{H^2} + \delta_0 \mathcal{E}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} (\varrho + \bar{\rho}) |\partial^\alpha \mathbf{u}(t)|^2 d\mathbf{x} + \mu \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \partial^\alpha \mathbf{u}(t)|^2 d\mathbf{x} \\ &\lesssim C(\delta_0) \|\mathbf{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \delta_0 \mathcal{E}^{\frac{6}{7}}(t) \|\mathbf{u}_t(t)\|_{H^2}^{\frac{8}{7}} + \mathcal{E}^2(t) \|\mathbf{u}_t(t)\|_{H^2} + \delta_0 \mathcal{E}^2(t) + I_9 \\ &\lesssim C(\delta_0) \|\mathbf{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \delta_0 \mathcal{E}^2(t) + I_9, \end{aligned} \quad (4.33)$$

where we have used (4.28) in the last inequality.

Adding (4.33) to (4.30) and using (4.31), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} \left[\|(\varrho, \mathbf{N})(t)\|_{H^3}^2 + \sum_{|\alpha|=3} \|\sqrt{\varrho + \bar{\rho}} \partial^\alpha \mathbf{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{i=0}^1 \|\nabla \partial_t^i \mathbf{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{i=0}^2 \|\sqrt{\varrho + \bar{\rho}} \partial_t^i \mathbf{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \right] \\ &+ \sum_{i=0}^1 \|\partial_t^i (\nabla \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}_t, \nabla \mathbf{u}_t)(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla^4 \mathbf{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim C(\delta_0) \|(\varrho, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{N})(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \delta_0 \mathcal{E}^2(t). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, integrating the above inequality over $(0, t)$, we get immediately

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|(\varrho, \mathbf{N})(t)\|_{H^3}^2 + \|\mathbf{u}(t)\|_{H^1}^2 + \|\nabla^3 \mathbf{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\mathbf{u}_t(t)\|_{H^1}^2 + \|\mathbf{u}_{tt}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \\
& + \int_0^t \left[\sum_{i=0}^1 \|\partial_s^i (\nabla \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}_s, \nabla \mathbf{u}_s)(s)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla^4 \mathbf{u}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 \right] ds \\
& \lesssim \|(\varrho_0, \mathbf{N}_0)\|_{H^3}^2 + \|\mathbf{u}_0\|_{H^3}^2 + \|\partial_t \mathbf{u}_0\|_{H^2}^2 + \|\partial_t^2 \mathbf{u}_0\|_{L^2}^2 \\
& + \int_0^t \left[C(\delta_0) \|(\varrho, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{N})(s)\|_{L^2}^2 + \delta_0 \mathcal{E}^2(s) \right] ds.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.34}$$

Applying the classical regularity theory on the Stokes equations to $(1.4)_2$, one sees that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla^2 \mathbf{u}_t\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla q_t\|_{L^2} & \lesssim \|\partial_t [(\nabla \times \mathbf{N}) \times (\mathbf{N} + \bar{\mathbf{M}}) - g\varrho \mathbf{e}_3 - (\varrho + \bar{\rho}) \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} - (\varrho + \bar{\rho}) \mathbf{u}_t]\|_{L^2} \\
& \lesssim (1 + \mathcal{E}^2) \|\varrho_t\|_{L^2} + (\mathcal{E} + \|\varrho_t\|_{L^2}) \|\mathbf{u}_t\|_{H^1} + (1 + \mathcal{E}) \|\mathbf{N}_t\|_{H^1} + \|\mathbf{u}_{tt}\|_{L^2} \\
& \lesssim \mathcal{E} + \|\mathbf{u}_t\|_{H^1} + \|\mathbf{u}_{tt}\|_{L^2},
\end{aligned} \tag{4.35}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla^2 \mathbf{u}\|_{H^2} + \|\nabla q\|_{H^2} & \lesssim \|(\nabla \times \mathbf{N}) \times (\mathbf{N} + \bar{\mathbf{M}}) - g\varrho \mathbf{e}_3 - (\varrho + \bar{\rho}) \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} - (\varrho + \bar{\rho}) \mathbf{u}_t\|_{H^2} \\
& \lesssim \mathcal{E} + \|\mathbf{u}_t\|_{H^2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.36}$$

On the other hand, letting $t \rightarrow 0$ in (4.28), we infer that

$$\|\partial_t \mathbf{u}_0\|_{H^2}^2 \lesssim \mathcal{E}_0^2. \tag{4.37}$$

Similarly, it's easy to infer that

$$\|\partial_t^2 \mathbf{u}_0\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \mathcal{E}_0^2. \tag{4.38}$$

Consequently, combining (4.34) with (4.35)–(4.38), we conclude

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{E}^2(t) + \|\mathbf{u}_t(t)\|_{H^2}^2 + \|\nabla q_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla q\|_{H^2}^2 + \|\mathbf{u}_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2 \\
& + \int_0^t \left[\sum_{i=0}^1 \|\partial_s^i (\nabla \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}_s, \nabla \mathbf{u}_s)(s)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla^4 \mathbf{u}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 \right] ds \\
& \lesssim \mathcal{E}_0^2 + \int_0^t \left[C(\delta_0) \|(\varrho, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{N})(s)\|_{L^2}^2 + \delta_0 \mathcal{E}^2(s) \right] ds, \quad \text{provided } \delta_0 \text{ is sufficiently small.}
\end{aligned}$$

In addition, from (4.28) we get the following estimate, which will be used in Section 5.

$$\|F\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\mathbf{G}\|_{H^2}^2 + \|\mathbf{H}\|_{H^1}^2 \lesssim \mathcal{E}^2,$$

where $F = -\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \varrho$, $\mathbf{G} := (\nabla \times \mathbf{N}) \times \mathbf{N} - (\varrho + \bar{\rho}) \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} - \varrho \mathbf{u}_t$, and $\mathbf{H} := \nabla \times (\mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{N})$.

Now, we mention that the local existence of classical solutions and global existence of classical small solutions to the 3D nonhomogeneous incompressible Navier-Stokes equations (i.e. $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{0}$ in (1.1)) have been established by many authors, see [29, 32] for example. However, the mathematical analysis becomes much more difficult for the MHD equations (1.1) due to the loss of magnetic diffusivity (dissipation). To our best knowledge, there are only two existence results on the 3D compressible MHD problem $(1.1)_1$ – $(1.1)_3$ without gravitational field. The first one is on the local existence of classical solutions by Kawashima [19, Theorem 6.14], while the second one is on the local existence of strong solutions to $(1.1)_1$ – $(1.1)_3$ by Li, et al. [24,

Theorem 1.1]. By a proper modification, one can adopt basic ideas of the fixed point theory as in [24, Theorem 1.1] to show that there exists a unique local classical solution $(\varrho, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{N}) \in C([0, T], H^3(\Omega) \times H^4(\Omega) \times H^3(\Omega))$ to the perturbed Cauchy problem (1.4)–(1.6) for any given initial data satisfying $\mathcal{E}(\varrho_0, \mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{N}_0) < \infty$. Moreover, the classical solution satisfies the estimates above if $\mathcal{E}(t) \leq \delta_0$ on $(0, T)$. The proof of the local existence on a horizontal periodic domain is standard (please refer to [9, 11] for well-posedness results of other models on horizontal periodic domains), in fact, it is easier than that for the corresponding compressible case, hence we omit it here. Finally, summing up the above estimates and the existence statement, we arrive at the following conclusion:

Proposition 4.1. *For any given initial data $(\varrho_0, \mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{N}_0) \in H^3 \times H^4 \times H^3$ satisfying (4.15) and $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}_0 = \operatorname{div} \mathbf{N}_0 = 0$, there exist a $T > 0$ and a classical unique solution $(\varrho, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{N}) \in C([0, T], H^3 \times H^4 \times H^3)$ to the perturbed problem (1.4)–(1.6). Moreover, there is a constant $\delta_0 \in (0, 1]$, such that if $\mathcal{E}(t) \leq \delta_0$ on $[0, T]$, then the classical solution satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{E}^2(t) + \|\mathbf{u}_t(t)\|_{H^2}^2 + \|(\nabla q, \mathbf{u}_t)_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla q\|_{H^2}^2 \\ & + \int_0^t \left[\sum_{i=0}^1 \|\partial_s^i (\nabla \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}_s, \nabla \mathbf{u}_s)(s)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla^4 \mathbf{u}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 \right] ds \\ & \leq C(\delta_0) \mathcal{E}_0^2 + \int_0^t [C(\delta_0) \|(\varrho, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{N})(s)\|_{L^2}^2 + \Lambda^* \mathcal{E}^2(s)] ds \end{aligned} \quad (4.39)$$

and

$$\|F\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\mathbf{G}\|_{H^2}^2 + \|\mathbf{H}\|_{H^1}^2 \leq C(\delta_0) \mathcal{E}^2, \quad (4.40)$$

where Λ^* is provided by Theorem 2.3.

5. Proof of Theorem 1.1

Now we are in a position to prove Theorem 1.1 by adopting the ideas in [8, 15, 31]. First, in view of Theorem 2.3, we can construct a linear solution $(\varrho^1, \mathbf{u}^1, \mathbf{N}^1) \in H^\infty$ to (1.7) with the initial data $(\bar{\varrho}_0, \bar{\mathbf{u}}_0, \bar{\mathbf{N}}_0) \in H^\infty$ and $\operatorname{div} \bar{\mathbf{u}}_0 = \operatorname{div} \bar{\mathbf{N}}_0 = 0$; moreover, the linear solution satisfies

$$e^{\Lambda^* t} \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\varrho}_0 \\ \bar{\mathbf{u}}_0 \\ \bar{\mathbf{N}}_0 \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}} = \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \varrho^1 \\ \mathbf{u}^1 \\ \mathbf{N}^1 \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}} = e^{\Lambda^* t} \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\varrho}_0 \\ \bar{\mathbf{u}}_0 \\ \bar{\mathbf{N}}_0 \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}}, \quad \Lambda^* \in (\Lambda/2, \Lambda), \quad (5.1)$$

$$0 < e^{\Lambda^* t} = \|u_3^1\|_{L^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\bar{u}_{03}\|_{L^2} = 1, \quad (5.2)$$

where the sharp linear growth rate $\Lambda > 0$ and the linear norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}}$ are defined by (2.55) and

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} \varrho \\ \mathbf{u} \\ \mathbf{N} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}} := \sqrt{\|\varrho\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^2}^2 + \|\mathbf{N}\|_{H^1}^2},$$

respectively, and $\bar{u}_{30}$ and u_3^1 stand for the third component of $\bar{\mathbf{u}}_0$ and $\mathbf{u}^1$, respectively.

Denote $C_0 := \|(\bar{\varrho}_0, \bar{\mathbf{u}}_0, \bar{\mathbf{N}}_0)\|_{\mathcal{E}} = \|(\bar{\varrho}_0, \bar{\mathbf{u}}_0, \bar{\mathbf{N}}_0)^T\|_{\mathcal{E}} := \mathcal{E}(\bar{\varrho}_0, \bar{\mathbf{u}}_0, \bar{\mathbf{N}}_0)$, $(\varrho_0^\delta, \mathbf{u}_0^\delta, \mathbf{N}_0^\delta) := \delta(\bar{\varrho}_0, \bar{\mathbf{u}}_0, \bar{\mathbf{N}}_0)$, and $C_1 := \|(\bar{\varrho}_0, \bar{\mathbf{u}}_0, \bar{\mathbf{N}}_0)\|_{L^2}$. By virtue of Proposition 4.1, there exists a unique local classical solution $(\varrho^\delta, \mathbf{u}^\delta, \mathbf{N}^\delta) \in C([0, T], H^3 \times H^4 \times H^3)$ to (1.4), emanating from the initial data $(\varrho_0^\delta, \mathbf{u}_0^\delta, \mathbf{N}_0^\delta)$ with $\|(\varrho_0^\delta, \mathbf{u}_0^\delta, \mathbf{N}_0^\delta)\|_{\mathcal{E}} = C_0 \delta$. Let us now choose $\delta_0 \in (0, 1)$ as small as in Proposition

4.1 and let $C(\delta_0) > 0$ be the constant appearing in Proposition 4.1 for the fixed choice of δ_0 . Let $\iota = \min\{\delta_0, \varepsilon_0\}$, and $\delta \in (0, \iota)$ satisfy

$$T^\delta = \frac{1}{\Lambda^*} \ln \frac{2\varepsilon_0}{\delta} > 0, \quad \text{i.e. } \delta e^{\Lambda^* T^\delta} = 2\varepsilon_0, \quad (5.3)$$

where the value of ε_0 will be fixed later to be sufficiently small and independent of δ . We then define

$$T^* = \sup \left\{ t \in (0, T^{\max}) \left| \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \varrho^\delta \\ \mathbf{u}^\delta \\ \mathbf{N}^\delta \end{pmatrix} (t) \right\|_{\mathcal{E}} \leq \delta_0 \right. \right\}$$

and

$$T^{**} = \sup \left\{ t \in (0, T^{\max}) \left| \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \varrho^\delta \\ \mathbf{u}^\delta \\ \mathbf{N}^\delta \end{pmatrix} (t) \right\|_{L^2} \leq 2\delta C_1 e^{\Lambda^* t} \right. \right\},$$

where $T^{\max}$ denotes the maximal time of existence. Obviously, $T^* T^{**} > 0$, and furthermore,

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} \varrho^\delta \\ \mathbf{u}^\delta \\ \mathbf{N}^\delta \end{pmatrix} (T^*) \right\|_{\mathcal{E}} = \delta_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \varrho^\delta \\ \mathbf{u}^\delta \\ \mathbf{N}^\delta \end{pmatrix} (T^{**}) \right\|_{L^2} = 2\delta C_1 e^{\Lambda^* T^{**}} \quad (5.4)$$

if $T^* < \infty$ and $T^{**} < \infty$. Then for all $t \leq \min\{T^\delta, T^*, T^{**}\}$, we deduce from the estimate (4.39), and the definitions of T^* and T^{**} that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \varrho^\delta \\ \mathbf{u}^\delta \\ \mathbf{N}^\delta \end{pmatrix} (t) \right\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2 &\leq C(\delta_0) \delta^2 \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\varrho}_0 \\ \bar{\mathbf{u}}_0 \\ \bar{\mathbf{N}}_0 \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2 + \Lambda^* \int_0^t \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \varrho^\delta \\ \mathbf{u}^\delta \\ \mathbf{N}^\delta \end{pmatrix} (s) \right\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2 ds \\ &\quad + C(\delta_0) \int_0^t \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \varrho^\delta \\ \mathbf{u}^\delta \\ \mathbf{N}^\delta \end{pmatrix} (s) \right\|_{L^2}^2 ds \\ &\leq \Lambda^* \int_0^t \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \varrho^\delta \\ \mathbf{u}^\delta \\ \mathbf{N}^\delta \end{pmatrix} (s) \right\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2 ds + C_0 C(\delta_0) \delta^2 + 4C(\delta_0) C_1^2 \delta^2 e^{2\Lambda^* t} \\ &\leq \Lambda^* \int_0^t \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \varrho^\delta \\ \mathbf{u}^\delta \\ \mathbf{N}^\delta \end{pmatrix} (s) \right\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2 ds + C_2 \delta^2 e^{2\Lambda^* t} \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

for some constant $C_2 := C_2(\delta_0) > 0$ independent of δ . Then applying Gronwall's inequality to the above estimate, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \varrho^\delta \\ \mathbf{u}^\delta \\ \mathbf{N}^\delta \end{pmatrix} (t) \right\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2 &\leq C_2 \delta^2 e^{2\Lambda^* t} + C_2 \delta^2 e^{\Lambda^* t} \int_0^t \Lambda^* e^{\Lambda^* s} ds \\ &\leq C_2 \delta^2 e^{2\Lambda^* t} + C_2 \delta^2 e^{2\Lambda^* t} = 2C_2 \delta^2 e^{2\Lambda^* t} \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

for any $t \leq \min\{T^\delta, T^*, T^{**}\}$.

Let $(\varrho^d, \mathbf{u}^d, \mathbf{N}^d) = (\varrho^\delta, \mathbf{u}^\delta, \mathbf{N}^\delta) - \delta(\varrho^l, \mathbf{u}^l, \mathbf{N}^l)$. Then $(\varrho_\delta^a, \mathbf{u}_\delta^a, \mathbf{N}_\delta^a) := \delta(\varrho^l, \mathbf{u}^l, \mathbf{N}^l)$ is also a linear solution to (1.7) with the initial data $(\varrho_0^\delta, \mathbf{u}_0^\delta, \mathbf{N}_0^\delta) \in H^\infty$. Moreover, $(\varrho^d, \mathbf{u}^d, \mathbf{N}^d)$ satisfies the following non-homogenous equations:

$$\begin{cases} \varrho_t^d + \bar{\rho}' u_3^d = F^\delta, \\ \bar{\rho} \mathbf{u}_t^d + \nabla q^d + g \varrho^d \mathbf{e}_3 - \mu \Delta \mathbf{u}^d - (\nabla \times \mathbf{N})^d \times \bar{\mathbf{M}} = \mathbf{G}^\delta, \\ \mathbf{N}_t^d - \nabla \times (\mathbf{u}^d \times \bar{\mathbf{M}}) = \mathbf{H}^\delta, \\ \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}^d = 0, \operatorname{div} \mathbf{N}^d = 0, \end{cases}$$

where

$$\begin{pmatrix} F^\delta \\ \mathbf{G}^\delta \\ \mathbf{H}^\delta \end{pmatrix} := \begin{pmatrix} -\mathbf{u}^\delta \cdot \nabla \varrho^\delta \\ (\nabla \times \mathbf{N}^\delta) \times \mathbf{N}^\delta - (\varrho^\delta + \bar{\rho}) \mathbf{u}^\delta \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}^\delta - \varrho \mathbf{u}_t^\delta \\ \nabla \times (\mathbf{u}^\delta \times \mathbf{N}^\delta) \end{pmatrix}$$

with initial conditions

$$(\varrho^d(0), \mathbf{u}^d(0), \mathbf{N}^d(0)) = \mathbf{0}, \quad \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}_0^d = 0 \text{ and } \operatorname{div} \mathbf{N}_0^d = 0.$$

From the estimates (4.40) and (5.6), it follows that

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} F^\delta \\ \mathbf{G}^\delta \\ \mathbf{H}^\delta \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}}^2 \leq 2C_2 C(\delta_0) \delta^2 e^{2\Lambda^* t} \text{ for any } t \leq \min\{T^\delta, T^*, T^{**}\}.$$

Now, with the help of Proposition 3.1 and Duhamel's principle, we follow a procedure similar to that in [7, Section 4] to infer that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \varrho^d \\ \mathbf{u}^d \\ \mathbf{N}^d \end{pmatrix} (t) \right\|_{L^2} &\leq \int_0^t e^{\Lambda(t-s)} \left\| \begin{pmatrix} F^\delta \\ \mathbf{G}^\delta \\ \mathbf{H}^\delta \end{pmatrix} (s) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}} ds \\ &\leq 2C_2 C(\delta_0) \delta^2 e^{\Lambda t} \int_0^t e^{(2\Lambda^* - \Lambda)s} ds \leq \frac{2C_2 C(\delta_0) \delta^2}{2\Lambda^* - \Lambda} e^{2\Lambda^* t} := C_3 \delta^2 e^{2\Lambda^* t}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

where we have used the fact that $2\Lambda^* - \Lambda > 0$.

Now, we claim that

$$T^\delta = \min\{T^\delta, T^*, T^{**}\}, \tag{5.8}$$

provided that small ε_0 is taken to be

$$\varepsilon_0 = \min\left\{\frac{\delta_0}{4\sqrt{2C_2}}, \frac{C_1}{3C_3}, \frac{1}{4C_3}\right\}. \tag{5.9}$$

Indeed, if $T^* = \min\{T^\delta, T^*, T^{**}\}$, then by (5.6) and (5.3) we have

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} \varrho^\delta \\ \mathbf{u}^\delta \\ \mathbf{N}^\delta \end{pmatrix} (T^*) \right\|_{\mathcal{E}} \leq \sqrt{2C_2} \delta e^{\Lambda^* T^*} \leq \sqrt{2C_2} \delta e^{\Lambda^* T^\delta} = 2\sqrt{2C_2} \varepsilon_0 < \delta_0,$$

which contradicts with (5.4). On the other hand, if $T^{**} = \min\{T^\delta, T^*, T^{**}\}$, in view of (5.1), (5.3), (5.7) and the fact that $\Lambda/2 < \Lambda^* \leq \Lambda$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \begin{pmatrix} \varrho^\delta \\ \mathbf{u}^\delta \\ \mathbf{N}^\delta \end{pmatrix} (T^{**}) \right\|_{L^2} &\leq \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \varrho_\delta^a \\ \mathbf{u}_\delta^a \\ \mathbf{N}_\delta^a \end{pmatrix} (T^{**}) \right\|_{L^2} + \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \varrho^d \\ \mathbf{u}^d \\ \mathbf{N}^d \end{pmatrix} (T^{**}) \right\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq \delta \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \varrho^l \\ \mathbf{u}^l \\ \mathbf{N}^l \end{pmatrix} (T^{**}) \right\|_{L^2} + C_3 \delta^2 e^{2\Lambda^* T^{**}} \\
&\leq \delta C_1 e^{\Lambda^* T^{**}} + C_3 \delta^2 e^{2\Lambda^* T^{**}} \leq \delta e^{\Lambda^* T^{**}} (C_1 + 2C_3 \varepsilon_0) \\
&< 2\delta C_1 e^{\Lambda^* T^{**}},
\end{aligned}$$

which also contradicts with (5.4). Therefore, (5.8) holds.

Finally, we again use (5.9), (5.7) and (5.2) to deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u_3^\delta(T^\delta)\|_{L^2} &\geq \|u_{\delta 3}^a(T^\delta)\|_{L^2} - \|u_3^d(T^\delta)\|_{L^2} = \delta \|u_3^l(T^\delta)\|_{L^2} - \|u_3^d(T^\delta)\|_{L^2} \\
&\geq \delta e^{\Lambda^* T^\delta} - C_3 \delta^2 e^{2\Lambda^* T^\delta} \geq 2\varepsilon_0 - 4C_3 \varepsilon_0^2 \geq \varepsilon_0,
\end{aligned} \tag{5.10}$$

where $u_{\delta 3}^a$ and $u_3^d(T^\delta)$ denote the third component of $\mathbf{u}_\delta^a$ and $\mathbf{u}^d(T^\delta)$, respectively. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Acknowledgements. The research of Fei Jiang was supported by the NSFC (Grant No. 11101044 and 11271051), the research of Song Jiang by NSFC (Grant No. 11229101) and the National Basic Research Program under the Grant 2011CB309705.

References

- [1] R. A. Adams, J.F. Fournier John, Sobolev Space, 2005, Academic Press: New York.
- [2] H. Cabannes, Theoretical Magnetofluidynamics, Academic Press, New York, 1970.
- [3] T.G. Cowling, Magnetohydrodynamics, Interscience Publishers, New York, 1957.
- [4] R. Duan, F. Jiang, S. Jiang, Rayleigh-Taylor instability for compressible rotating flows, submitted, 2011.
- [5] D. Erban, The equations of motion of a perfect fluid with free boundary are not well posed, Comm. PDE **12** (1987), 1175-1201.
- [6] Y. Guo, C. Hallstrom, D. Spirn, Dynamics near unstable, interfacial fluids, Comm. Math. Phys. **270** (2007), 635-689.
- [7] Y. Guo, H. Hwang, On the dynamical Rayleigh-Taylor instability, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **167** (2003), 235-253.
- [8] Y. Guo, W. Strauss, Instability of periodic BGK equilibria, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **48** (1995), 861-894.
- [9] Y. Guo, I. Tice, Almost exponential decay of periodic viscous surface waves without surface tension. Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **207** (2013), 459-531.
- [10] Y. Guo, I. Tice, Linear Rayleigh-Taylor instability for viscous, compressible fluids, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **42** (2011), 1688-1720.
- [11] Y. Guo, I. Tice, Local well-posedness of the viscous surface wave problem without surface tension. Anal PDE 2012, to appear.
- [12] Y. Guo, I. Tice, Compressible, inviscid Rayleigh-Taylor instability, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **60** (2011), 677-712.

- [13] R. Hide, Waves in a heavy, viscous, incompressible, electrically conducting fluid of variable density, in the presence of a magnetic field, *Proc. Roy. Soc. (London) A* **233** (1955), 376-396.
- [14] H. Hwang, Variational approach to nonlinear gravity-driven instability in a MHD setting, *Quart. Appl. Math.* **66** (2008), 303-324.
- [15] J. Jang, I. Tice, Instability theory of the Navier-Stokes-Poisson equations, arXiv:1105.5128v2[math.AP] 13 Jun 2011 (2011).
- [16] F. Jiang, S. Jiang, G. Ni, Nonlinear instability for nonhomogeneous incompressible viscous fluids, *Science China Math.* **56** (2013), 665-686.
- [17] F. Jiang, S. Jiang, W. Wang, On the Rayleigh-Taylor instability for the incompressible viscous magnetohydrodynamic equations, arXiv:1204.6402v2 [math.GM] 1 May 2012.
- [18] F. Jiang, S. Jiang, W. Wang, On the Rayleigh-Taylor instability for two uniform viscous incompressible flows, submitted, 2012.
- [19] S. Kawashima, Systems of a hyperbolic-parabolic composite type, with applications to the equations of magnetohydrodynamics, Ph. D. Thesis, Kyoto University, 1983.
- [20] M. Kruskal, M. Schwarzschild, Some instabilities of a completely ionized plasma, *Proc. Roy. Soc. (London) A* **233** (1954), 348-360.
- [21] A.G. Kulikovskiy, G.A. Lyubimov, *Magnetohydrodynamics*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1965.
- [22] J. Larmor, How could a rotating body such as the sun become a magnet. *Rep. Brit. Assoc. Adv. Sci.*, 159, 1919.
- [23] L.D. Landau, E.M. Lifshitz, L.P. Pitaevskii, *Electrodynamics of Continuous Media*, Vol.8, 1984 (Translated from the Russian).
- [24] X. Li, N. Su, D. Wang, Local strong solution to the compressible magnetohydrodynamic flow with large data, *J. Hyper. Diff. Eqns.* **8** (2011), 4315-4369.
- [25] F. Lin, P. Zhang, Global small solutions to MHD type system (I): 3-D case, *Comm. Pure. Appl. Math.* **154** (2013) (to appear).
- [26] L. Nirenberg, On elliptic partial differential equations, *Estratto dagli Ann. del. Scuola Norm. Super. Pisa Ser. III*, **XIII**, Fasc. II, 1959.
- [27] J. Prüss, G. Simonett, On the Rayleigh-Taylor instability for the two-phase Navier-Stokes equations, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **59** (2010), 1853-1871.
- [28] L. Rayleigh, Analytic solutions of the Rayleigh equations for linear density profiles, *Proc. London. Math. Soc.* **14** (1883), 170-177.
- [29] L. Tong, H. Yuan, Classical solutions to Navier-Stokes equations for nonhomogeneous incompressible fluids with non-negative densities, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **362** (2010), 476-504.
- [30] Y. Wang, Critical magnetic number in the MHD Rayleigh-Taylor instability, *J. Math. Phys.* **53** (2012), 073701.
- [31] Y. Wang, I. Tice, The viscous surface-internal wave problem: nonlinear Rayleigh-Taylor instability, *Comm. PDE* **37** (2012), 1967-2028.
- [32] P. Zhang, Global smooth solutions to the 2D nonhomogeneous Navier-Stokes equations, *Inter. Math. Research Notices*, Article ID rnn098, doi:10.1093/imrn/rnn098, 2008.